The
Catholic Historical Review

VOLUME VI OCTOBER, 1920 NUMBER 3

"CATHOLIC TRUTH AND HISTORICAL TRUTH"

The above title is taken from an article which a well-known historical critic, Mr. C. C. Coulton, contributed to the *Contemporary Review* a few years ago. As might be surmised from the implied contrast between "Catholic Truth" and "Historical Truth," the paper in question was a trenchant attack on various Catholic historians and apologists who were roundly accused of defending "Catholic Truth," *i.e.* the truth of Catholic doctrine, at the expense of "Historical Truth," or the truth of history. We have borrowed Mr. Coulton's title. But it is no part of our purpose to attempt anything like a direct answer to his charges. For, indeed, at this distance of time and place such an answer must needs be useless and impracticable. And, what is more, it would scarcely be fair to any of the parties concerned. It would be doing a sorry service to the accused Catholic writers to traverse accusations of which our readers, in all probability, have never heard. We should run the risk of being unfair to their assailant if the grounds of his accusation were not stated in full. And to do this, or anything like it, would be very hard on our readers. But apart from the particular case of these Catholic historians and apologists and their Protestant critic, this literary episode raises a broad question of more general interest, a question which may well seem to have a special claim on the attention of readers of the CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW. This is clearly the case, for readers of a review which claims to be at once "Catholic" and "Historical" cannot well be indifferent to the suggestion that there is a sharp distinction, if not a necessary rivalry or antagonism, between Catholic Truth and Historical Truth; or, in other words, that Catholic writers, even when they profess to be writing history, are more solicitous to glorify their faith than to tell the facts, as they really happened, without fear or favor, and so

are content to sacrifice historical truth in the supposed interests of Catholic doctrine. At first sight some may be disposed to dismiss the charge as an invidious invention of Protestant prejudice. For are we not familiar with the fact that the falsification of history has really been a more common practice in the other camp? Did not Joseph de Maistre have good warrant for his complaint that history for the past three centuries has been a conspiracy against the truth? Has not Cardinal Newman exposed the falsity of Protestant literary and historical tradition? And are not later Catholic critics still engaged in refuting these false statements and setting right the blunders of Protestant historians?

Yet, strange and startling as this charge may seem, we can scarcely afford to dismiss it in this summary fashion. And it may well be that we shall find, when we come to examine it more closely, that, though it may be somewhat strained and overstated in the hands of hostile critics, there is, withal, some real ground for misgiving lest an indiscreet zeal for the interests of doctrinal orthodoxy should tend to impair the impartiality of our historians. Indeed it could not well be otherwise, human nature being what it is. And while we can confidently claim that an enlightened zeal for Catholic orthodoxy can be happily harmonized with judical impartiality and a scrupulous accuracy in the statement of historical facts, we could hardly expect to find that, as a matter of fact, all Catholic historians fulfil these requirements, or that Protestants and Rationalists or other outsiders have been allowed to have a monopoly in blunders, either in the perversion of facts, or in the partisan presentment of history. Nay, curiously enough, this fond vision is not only something too good to be looked for in this imperfect world, but it is scarcely compatible with Catholic orthodoxy. For it would seem to involve a sort of literary Lutheranism, in which historians would be, so to say, justified by their faith. According to Catholic teaching, on the contrary, orthodoxy in doctrine does not necessarily imply any freedom from moral lapses. And while Catholic historians are as apt to be mistaken as their Protestant brethren, they can claim no exemption from the imperfections that give rise to faults of injustice or unfairness. Our historical literature happily contains many works which we may justly regard with pride and satisfaction. But,

on the other hand, it has some pages which have been deservedly censured by the best Catholic critics.

We are not now concerned with other sources of error common to all alike, such as defective or misleading evidence, spurious documents, corrupt popular traditions. But the point is that, apart from all this, Catholic ecclesiastical historians are in some danger of being biased in their judgment and dealing less than the even-handed justice demanded of true historians. In a word, it is suggested that Catholic chroniclers, biographers and writers of church history, as a result of their zeal for the Faith and their loyalty to Holy Church, have presented a picture of the past which shows more favor to Saints and Popes and Bishops, and bears more hardly on hostile kings, and schismatics and heretics, than is warranted by evidence weighed in the unbiased balance of rigid impartiality. And, as we have said, we cannot afford to dismiss this as a groundless and gratuitous invitation of the enemy. It is likely enough, indeed, that like other charges, it is exaggerated in the incisive indictments of hostile critics. But, for the purpose of our argument, it may be well to leave this aside and confine our attention to the more measured and authoritative censure of Catholic scholars, in whose case there is no room for suspicion that the charge may owe its origin to Protestant prejudice. And for this purpose it may be enough to cite two noteworthy examples, to wit, Melchior Cano's grave words on the defects of our earlier historical literature in point of accuracy and impartiality, and Cardinal Newman's significant account of the limitations imposed upon Catholic historians by the jealousy of orthodox opinion and the stress of religious controversy.

When the great Dominican theologian, in his classic work, *De Locis Theologicis*, comes to speak of the use of human history in theology, it is only natural that he should describe the characteristics of that true and trustworthy history which can stand the theologian in good stead. And it is no less natural that he should cite some examples in illustration. This is, indeed, just what he does. But the reader may be somewhat startled to find that this Catholic divine is, however, reluctantly compelled to give the palm to pagan historians, and is fain to lament that Christian writers have not told the history of the saints with that

fidelity and rigid regard for truth with which Diogenes Laertius has written the lives of the Greek philosophers, and Suetonius has painted an impartial picture of the Roman Caesars, with all the lights and all the shadows.

> In hisce vero auctoribus tametsi pietatem absolutaque virtutis officia spectare non licet, licet tamen probitatem quamdam bonitatemque naturae. Quidam enim eorum aut veritatis amore inducti, aut ingenui pudoris verecundia usque adeo a mendacio abhorruerunt, ut jam pudendum fortasse sit, historicos gentium quosdam veraciores fuisse quam nostros. Dolenter hoc dico potius quam contumeliose, multo a Laertio severius vitas Philosophorum scriptas, quam a Christianis vitas sanctorum, longeque incorruptius et integrius Suetonium res Caesarum exposuisse, quam exposuerint catholici non res dico imperatorum, sed martyrum, virginum, et confessorum. Ille enim in probis, aut Philosophis, aut principibus, nec vitia, nec suspiciones vitiorum tacent, in improbis vero etiam colores virtutum produnt. Nostri autem plerique vel affectibus inserviunt, vel de industria quoque ita multa confingunt, ut eorum me nimirum non solum pudeat, sed etiam taedeat. Hos enim intelligo ecclesiae Christi cum nihil utilitatis attulisse, tum incommodationis plurimum. Nominibus parco, quoniam huius loci iudicium morum etiam est, et non eruditionis tantum: in qua liberior potest esse censura. Nam quae morum est, haec debet profecto esse et in vivos cautior et in mortuos reverentior. Certum est autem qui ficte et fallaciter historiam ecclesiasticam scribunt, eos viros bonos atque synceros esse non posse, totamque eorum narrationem inventam esse aut ad quaestum aut ad errorem, quorum alterum foedum est, alterum perniciosum. Iustissima est Ludovici querella de historiis quibusdam in ecclesia confictis. Prudenter ille sane ac graviter eos arguit, qui pietatis loco duxerint mendacia pro religione fingere. Id quod et maxime periculosum est et minime necessarium. Mendaci quippe homini ne verum quidem credere solemus.[1]

Will it be said that Cano is somewhat too severe in his censure, or that he gives no evidence to support these startling statements? So far as the lives and the legends of the saints are concerned, the answer is writ large in the herculean labors of the Bollandists, and some practical proofs on a smaller scale, and more accessible to all, may be seen in the revised lessons of the Roman Breviary.

It is true no doubt that Cano's censure can only affect the historians and ecclesiastical biographers of an earlier generation. And it may be hoped that considerable improvement has been

[1] *De Locis Theologicis*, lib XI., cap. VI., pp. 373–374, Edition of Salamanca, 1613. (Bouquillon Library, Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.)

made in these matters after the admirable work done since his time by such true scholars as the Bollandists and the Benedictines of St. Maur, who were scarcely less remarkable for their candor and impartiality than they were for their patient industry and their scholarly accuracy of statement. But apart from the fact that this improvement is largely confined to special fields of studies, its beneficent influence on our Church history as a whole is checked by the unfortunate effects of post-Reformation controversy.

On this point it will be enough to cite the remarkable admission made by Cardinal Newman in the course of his interesting correspondence with Father Coleridge on the subjects which might be treated with advantage in the pages of his new magazine *The Month*.

"Nothing," writes Newman, "would be better than an historical review, but who would bear it? Unless one doctored all one's facts, one should be thought a bad Catholic.

"The truth is there is a keen conflict going on just now between two parties, one in the Church, and one out of it—and at such seasons extreme views alone are in favor, and a man who is not extreme is thought treacherous.

"I sometimes think of King Lear's daughters, and consider that they, after all, may be the truest who are in speech more measured." Letter of July 24, 1864. (v. *The Month*, January, 1903, p. 4).

This letter brings out very forcibly the peculiar difficulty and delicacy of the present problem. In purely secular history, it is for the most part a far more simple matter. A writer who is dealing with some historical struggle in which national or party issues are involved is naturally prone to favor his own people, or his own party, at the expense of their opponents. But a simple sense of his duty as an historian will make him seek to be scrupulously fair to the other side, and keep on his guard against his own prepossessions and prejudices. He knows that the truth of history is something of far greater moment than the pride of country or the interests of a political party. "Amicus Plato, sed magis amica veritas." Or he may say to his country, as the Royalist poet said to his mistress:

I could not love thee, Dear, so much;
Loved I not Honor more.

Thus the patriotic American, or English, or French historian may be tempted to give the palm to his own country. But he is restrained by the luminous evidence of truth. And when he follows this guiding light, he is sure of being rewarded by the approval of the best and wisest of his own people.

But, as we have said, the question here at issue is by no means so simple. For it cannot be said that the mere natural facts of human history are something of far higher moment than the supernatural truths of Catholic doctrine. And writers whose chief solicitude is to safeguard and illustrate the truth of that doctrine are scarcely in the same case as those who would shrink from setting forth the facts of history; from shame, or fear, or personal interest, or any other unworthy motive. Hence it comes, as we see from Newman's remarkable admission, that some serious and religious-minded men would fain have us "doctor" the crude facts of human history, and they would look with suspicion on the orthodoxy of those Catholic historians who venture to depreciate this dubious process.

This "doctoring," it may be remarked, need not be taken to imply any direct and deliberate falsification of the evidence, still less any impudent assertion of the thing that is not. For the most part, we suppose, it has reference to a too decorous reticence on the subject of scandals in ecclesiastical history. From what has been said so far, and more especially from our appeal to the weighty words of Melchior Cano and Cardinal Newman, it will be readily seen that we are not disposed to sympathise with this policy of suppression. For our own part we should prefer to see a school of Catholic ecclesiastical historians who could challenge comparison with Suetonius and Diogenes Laertius in point of strict justice and impartiality, who frankly recognize the wrong done by great churchmen and the good done by heretics and persecutors. But this preference need not prevent us from endeavoring to do justice to historians of another stamp. Nay, this very principle of judicial impartiality so strongly recommended by the Spanish Dominican has its application here, as well as in our treatment of popes and emperors, or saints and heretics. And it is to be feared that some who are hasty in their

censure of idealised history or the policy of suppression do not always bear this in mind. For, after all, it is possible to go too far in this direction.

We cannot, it is true, go too far in our censure of everything that savours of fraud and falsehood. And we may well think that it is as wrong to deceive others by the "suppressio veri" as by the "suggestio falsi," and, indeed, the one very naturally issues in the other. But it is well to remember that all suppression or withholding of facts is not necessarily tantamount to deception. And sometimes this course may be necessary not merely for the sake of religion, or charity, or reverence for those in authority, but in the interest of justice and historical truth. This point may be illustrated by a practice observed in English criminal trials, to wit, the suppression of previous convictions. Those who are familiar with our courts of justice know that when a prisoner has been tried and convicted of theft, for example, it often happens that, after all the witnesses have been duly examined, and counsel on both sides have said their say, and the judge has summed up, and the jury have deliberated and given their verdict, a prison warder goes into the witness-box and produces a damning record showing that the prisoner has many times been convicted of the same offence. A simple visitor might suppose that all this had only been discovered at the last moment. But of course the facts have been known to the authorities all along; but, by a wise rule of the courts, they have been purposely suppressed, or withheld from the jury during the trial, in the best interests of truth and justice. For it is recognized that although these facts are true and are clearly established, their disclosure at any earlier stage of the proceedings might create a prejudice in the minds of the jury and lead them to draw a conclusion in no wise warranted by the evidence. The fact that the man has often committed the crime before does not really prove that he is guilty now, and in spite of the previous convictions he may really be innocent. And yet the disclosure of true facts may have a misleading effect, and, however illogically, issue in a false conclusion and a miscarriage of justice.

The application of this example to the case of historical suppression is sufficiently obvious. For the judge who suppresses

the evidence of the previous convictions does not mean to dispute the true facts. He is only seeking to preclude the false conclusions which may too probably follow from their inopportune disclosure. And so, in much the same way, the historian may feel that he, too, is sometimes warranted in omitting to mention facts which, however true in themselves, are only too likely to lead his readers to draw false conclusions. As we have already intimated, we are inclined to regard this as a mistaken, if not a perilous policy. But be this as it may, it is well to recognize its true purpose and meaning. And though, as will presently appear, it should have no place in historical research, properly so called, it may be well to add that it is perfectly legitimate and even necessary, in certain forms of historical, or quasi-historical literature.

Thus, for example, however wrong it may be to give one side alone when we are supposed to be presenting a whole history, an avowed selection for some special purpose, is clearly allowable. The lives of the saints, to take an obvious instance in illustration, do not purport to be a history of mankind as a whole. And the hagiographer cannot be said to suppress the evil deeds of sinners. In this way, indeed, panegyric and idealized history may be allowed their legitimate place in our religious literature. All must condemn a national history which gives every victory its appropriate place, while the defeats are passed over in silence. But who would blame a book of heroic deeds, or a chronicle of national victories, compiled for the encouragement and inspiration of British and American boyhood? So, in like manner, the most resolute advocate of historical candor would surely exclude grave ecclesiastical scandals from books designed for the instruction of children.

Even apart from such special cases, some measure of selection, and consequent suppression of facts, is made necessary by the size and relative proportions of historical writings. In the spacious pages of Baronius, there is room for a detailed account of the principal figures in the story and some estimate of their personal character. But this would be out of place in a smaller work, which can only give the leading events in history. To introduce such matters as the private vices of rulers or other public men into a little sketch of this kind would give them a

wholly disproportionate importance. And it should be remembered that false proportions may really involve a misrepresentation as grave as any positive statement. This point may be illustrated by the art of the caricaturist, which generally consists in a grotesque or satirical exaggeration of some leading feature or distinctive characteristic of the victim. But, in point of fact, in the little cartoons in the newspapers, which are necessarily much less than life-size, it is only in their want of due proportion to the rest of the drawing that the grotesque features are false and exaggerated. In like manner, the historical artist who does not observe the proportions of his drawing, and the scale of color, may effectively convey a calumny when he fancies that he is only making a frank and faithful statement of established facts.

Closely connected with this question of relative proportions is the difference in *genre*, or nature, of the subjects treated in historical writings. One writer, for example, may set himself to record the history of a national literature, and he will very rightly leave on the one side all the extraneous matter that is irrevelant for his purpose. Nay, even, within what is in some respects his own province, he must be content to pass by a mass of material that can scarcely claim to be counted as literature, the *biblia a-biblia* as Lamb calls them, or "books that are not books." While if he is wise, in dealing with the makers and masters of the national literature, he will give most of his care and attention to the study of their art and their writings, in a word, to their true life work, and will not waste his time on their irrelevant activities in alien fields, still less on the possible follies and frailties of their private life. For the student of literature, or of literary history, is not concerned to know of the vices of poets; but should seek rather such knowledge as will enable him to understand and appreciate their glorious poetry.

And may not much the same be said of religious or ecclesiastical history? If the real life of a poet, the only part of it that counts for much with real students of literature, is reckoned by the days and hours that he devoted to the cultivation of his art, so in like manner, those who would understand and appreciate the true nature of Church history will give their best attention to the wondrous works and the bright example of the saints, to the faithful and laborious lives of zealous popes and bishops,

and the legislative work of councils, and the ordered hosts of religious men and women, and the glories of sacred art, and learning, and literature. For it is here, and not in the scandals and abuses, or in the unworthy lives of those unhappy pastors who were faithless and false to their high calling, that we can best read the real life story of the Church of God.

This aspect of the subject may be commended to the attention of those whose minds are too much occupied with the question of the scandals and abuses. And it may serve to show that our idealistic Church historians are not altogether without some justification.

As we have already suggested, there is a legitimate place for panegyric in our literature, though its scope is other than that of the historian. The latter, to be sure, must give us a faithful picture, with all the lights and all the shadows. But the preacher, with a more pleasing task on hand, may take up his parable, and give us glowing panegyrics of the saints, or sing the praises and glories of the Holy City of God. Lucian, in his delightful dissertation on the question, "How History ought to be Written," complained that some would-be historians of his day were mistaking their office and were putting forth panegyrics in the place of histories. If we are suffering from any analogous confusion of diverse forms of literature, just now, we should be disposed to say that it is not so much history and panegyric as historical and apologetical writings, properly so called, that are too often apt to be confounded with one another.

This unfortunate confusion of historical with apologetical, or controversial writings is, to some extent, inevitable in the circumstances. For though it is true that these two forms of literature are perfectly distinct one from another, and the dividing line is clearly marked, in point of fact, historians and controversians have a good deal of ground in common. From the time of the Reformation, if not from a considerably earlier date, religious controversy, to a great extent at any rate, turned on disputed questions of historical fact. And the history of the chief European nations is hopelessly involved in thorny questions of theological controversy. Hence the historian, however little it may be to his liking, is compelled to be something of a theologian, and the religious apologist, in his turn, is constrained to turn historian.

Something of the same kind, it may be remarked, has happened in other fields, for instance, in English political history since the latter part of the seventeenth century. For here, too, the whole story turns on points that are still debated between opposing parties. And thus, instead of English histories pure and simple, we have Whig histories and Tory histories, wherein the historical narrative is combined with the defense of a party or a political doctrine.

It may be well to insist that there is nothing necessarily invidious in this distinction between the diverse functions of the historian and the religious, or political, apologist. For both alike have their rightful place in literature, and the one office may well be as important and honorable as the other. In secular literature, indeed, we should be disposed to assign the historian of a people a higher rank than any political theorist, or champion of party principles. But the case is altered when we turn our attention to religious history and literature. Considered in themselves, we suppose, a dogmatic treatise "De Ecclesia Christi," or the controversial masterpieces of such Catholic champions as Bellarmine and Stapleton, may well be works of higher value and importance than any simple history of the Church, however strictly historical and based on a patient and dispassionate study of all the available evidence. But, be this as it may, it is well to insist on the essential distinction between history properly so called and religious controversy, or apologetics, and to bear in mind that in spite of any occasional and accidental association of the diverse offices, the aims, and the methods, and the duties of the apologist, or religious controversialist, are other than those of the historian.

The several duties of the historian and the controversialist are, indeed, as distinct in their way as those of the judge and the advocate. And what is right and proper in the one case may be highly reprehensible in the other. The controversialist, or the Catholic apologist, like the advocate in a court of justice, is the champion of a cause. He sets out to establish the authority of the Church and the Apostolic See and the truth of Catholic teaching. The evidence and the arguments by which his case are supported may be scattered in many places, and beset by difficulties or involved in obscurity. And it is his object to bring them to-

gether and set them forth in such luminous order as to give them their full force and cogency. With regard to the difficulties and specious objections that may seem likely to tell against the truth and mislead the wayward and unwary, he will do his best to meet them or lessen their force. And he will be careful to avoid any false steps which may defeat his object and serve the cause of the enemy.

On the other hand, the apologist's attitude toward heretical teachers and their false doctrine is equally simple and straightforward. His sole concern with them is to show that they are without authority and that their teaching is erroneous. On other points, no doubt, apart from their peculiar tenets, the heretics may have retained much of Catholic teaching intact, they may have labored for social and moral reform, and have done good work in other ways. Moreover, in some instances at any rate, their very errors may have been their misfortune rather than their fault, arising, maybe, from a want of adequate instruction in their religion, or from the political and social disorder of the times. But all this is outside the purview of theological censorship. And it can scarcely be taken into consideration by the religious controversialist, who very naturally confines his attention to the arduous task he has in hand, namely, the vindication of Church authority and orthodox doctrine, and the refutation of heretical teaching. But it is just those things in which the controversialist has no concern, that form the proper subject matter of the historian, whose duty it is to paint with an even brush a full and faithful picture of the past, with all its varying lights and shadows, freely showing the

> Fears of the brave and follies of the wise,

and in no wise seeking to hide the broken rays of spiritual truth and moral goodness that lighten the darkness of schism and heresy. Such, in the main, if each devoted his attention to his own proper province, would be the several duties of the Catholic apologist and the historian.

But, as we have said, for the reasons already noticed, these two branches of our religious literature have been involved in some confusion. Theological controversy, since the age of the Reformation, has turned on disputed points of historical fact, and Church history has consequently become more and more con-

troversial in its character. A Catholic author who sets himself to write a history of the Church in these last centuries, or to compose an historical study on some important phase in the religious revolution of the sixteenth century, will soon find that he is engaged in religious controversy, rather than simple historical research. In this way it may be said that a good deal of what is commonly called historical literature is somewhat in the case of that branch of science familiarly known as mixed mathematics. For these works, however admirable in their way, cannot be considered as history pure and simple, but belong, rather, to a new species of blended history and doctrinal controversy, in which indeed the controversial element predominates over the historical.

In some respects, it is true, the works we have in mind may be rightly regarded as strictly historical in character. For many of them are written in accordance with the best modern methods and give the reader an accurate record of ascertained facts, duly authenticated by exact references to the original sources. But the same course, it may be remarked, is adopted by any scholarly theologian who has occasion to make an historical point against his opponent. And this does not alter the fact that his work, in view of its primary purpose, is theology and not history. And much the same may be said of those books whose aim it is to present the historical evidence in support of Church authority and Catholic doctrine, and expose the errors and evil deeds of heretics and persecutors. In some cases, for example, in a monograph on the divorce of Catharine of Arragon, the whole book may be primarily controversial. In others, as in a Manual of Church History, there may be a larger proportion of purely historical matter. But in both, alike, allowance must be made for the doctrinal or apologetic aims which the author has in view, and which, naturally enough, guide him in his choice of subjects and in his presentment of the historical evidence. So far as this is a mere question of literary form, or of conventional classification, it may be freely allowed that it is a matter of very minor moment. True lovers of literature can have very little patience with those pedantic critics who condemn such great artists as Euripides, or Shakespeare, because, forsooth, they do not keep to the pure tragedy of Sophocles, but blend their tragic art with beggarly

elements which belong more properly to the comic muse. For whether we classify their plays as tragedy or comedy, or as a new blend of both, Euripides is still the most tragic of poets, and Shakespeare attains the true end of tragedy, which is to "purify by pity and terror." In much the same way it may be said that it matters not whether the books now in question are to be classified as history, or religious controversy, or historical apologetics so long as they effect a most desirable and necessary object, and vindicate the authority of the Church and the truth of Catholic doctrine.

From the same point of view, it may be urged that this is, after all, our main reason for taking any special interest in the study of Church history. In a word, it is just because the Catholic Church is the One True Church, that her story means more for us than that of the dead and buried beliefs of Egypt or Babylonia. How, then, can we well have a better or a more desirable history of the Church than one which in the very telling of the story is able, at the same time, to establish her authority and the truth of her doctrine? In the same way, it may be urged, that if, as we must allow, the teaching of the heretics is false and dangerous, this is all we need to know about them, and there can, therefore, be no reason for regretting the want of fuller and more impartial histories that might show the other side of the picture and bring out the various facts and mitigating circumstances which have been overlooked or forgotten.

To speak frankly, we fear that some readers may really be disposed to agree in this view of the matter. And, if so, we may take this as showing that the interest felt in such literature is, as we supposed, controversial, and not truly historical. In much the same way, we imagine, there are those who can take no interest in any mathematical calculations but such as serve some plain, practical purpose and could never appreciate purely abstract speculations, like Carnot's inimitable *Réflections sur la Métaphysique du Calcul Infinitésimal.* But readers who have any portion of the historical spirit will surely see the matter in a very different light. They will readily recognize, as all must do, the high merit of many of the Church histories and special monographs, such as those we have described above, books which combine a defense of the Catholic cause with practical historical

information. But they will ask, not unreasonably, for something more than this. They will seek, like those who delight in pure mathematical speculation, to study history for its own sake. They will turn its pages for another purpose than that of making out a case, or securing a triumph over their opponents. In a word, they will seek to understand the story of mankind, and grasp the cause and the meaning of the changing movements, whether good or evil. And this, as they know full well, is out of the reach of those who approach the study in the spirit of strife and controversy.

To illustrate this point, it will be enough to notice the very different way in which the history of the Middle Ages is treated, on the one side, by contending controversialists, whether Catholic or Protestant; and, on the other hand, by patient and dispassionate historical students. We all know those gloomy religionists who look back on that rich and fertile field of human history as on a time of ignorance, "the dark ages," when the great mass of mankind was sunk in "damnable idolatry." And we know, too, that far more pleasing company of amiable idealists who paint the same period as a veritable golden age, "the ages of faith," before vice came in with the pagan Renaissance, and heresy broke out in the Lutheran Reformation, when chivalry flourished in the court, and virtue in the cloister, and true philosophy in the schools and social unrest was a thing unknown. But, on the other hand, there are students who have learned to know the Middle Ages as they really were, from the frank and trustworthy testimony of contemporary literature. And, to speak plainly, the picture reflected in that luminous and faithful mirror is something very different both from the Protestant nightmare, and from the Catholic fool's paradise. For it reflects an age, rich indeed, in faith, and wisdom, and virtue, and chivalry, and charity; but its brightness is dimmed, withal, by dark shadows of heinous vice, and heresy, and false philosophy, and its peace is disturbed by deeds of violence and turbulent upheavals.

Looking at the matter from this point of view, we may well believe that, even on the hypothesis that what may be called the apologetic, or controversial, branch of our historical literature leaves little or nothing to be desired, there is still a good deal to be done in the interests of historical truth, in the way of a

broader and more impartial study of the past. But this is by no means all. For it remains to ask whether this broadening, or extention, of historical study is not, likewise, urgently demanded in the best interests of Catholic Truth itself. We have already seen how strongly Melchior Cano insisted on the importance of this courageous and candid history which tells the whole truth without flinching, and frankly shows the faults of our friends and the merits of our enemies; and how deeply he lamented the melancholy fact that Catholic historians were behind the heathen in these matters. But we have yet to notice the significance of the place where Cano gives utterance to these sentiments. He does not say all this in a dissertation, like that of Lucian in an earlier age, on the general question as to "How History ought to be Written." But he says it in his work, *De Locis Theologicis*; and in that section of the work which is devoted to the consideration of human history as one of those sources or instruments of theology. In other words, he is speaking expressly of that kind of history which can be of use to the Catholic theologian. And he plainly implies that history which is wanting in these essential qualities of rigid accuracy and perfect impartiality will be both unprofitable and perilous.

Historical truth, as we have seen, should assuredly be sought after for its own sake, and apart from any ulterior considerations. And we should have a poor opinion of the honesty of those, whether historians or others, who are honest only because this is the best and safest policy. But there are cases in which these reasons may be used with advantage. For though falsehood must always be condemned, silence may be allowable, or even a matter of duty, where harm is likely to be done by speaking. As we have suggested above, this was very probably the motive of the "doctoring" to which Newman refers, and it may also serve to explain the conduct of some of the historians censured by Cano for failing to note the faults of those whom they praised, and the good points of those whom they regarded with disfavor. They may have thought that such silence was more prudent, lest they should lessen the authority of rulers, or the teachers of truth, or strengthen the influence of the teachers of error. But in this a perilous policy was strangely adopted from prudential motives. For nothing is more likely to discredit the authority of our

historians, and to encourage exaggerated suspicions of evil, than want of openness in these matters.

The reader may have noticed what looks like a curious inconsistency in the passage which we quoted above from Melchior Cano. For after blaming Catholic historians because they do not imitate the plain-speaking of Suetonius and Laertius, he himself forebears to mention the names of these offenders, because, as he says, it is a question of moral blame and not a mere blunder, and on such matters we must observe more care in regard to the living and more reverence for the dead. For why should the memory of historians be treated more tenderly than that of kings and bishops or other historical characters? But, the truth is he is only observing the ordinary rules that guard against the danger of detraction. *Caeteris paribus* the faults of historians must, of course, be visited as severely as those of the others. But in this case, we suppose, they were not so public, or it was not so necessary to make them known, as was the case with the faults which they had treated too tenderly.

These rules in regard to the danger of detraction must not be forgotten by historians. But in the case of most of the great figures of history, the matter is generally sufficiently public, and a frank statement of facts is necessary in the general interest of historical truth, and even, as we have seen, for the sake of the offenders themselves, since openness is the surest safeguard against sinister suspicions. With regard to the other fault of which Cano complains, to wit, the failure to notice the good points in those who are regarded with disfavor, the moral duty of the historian is yet more obvious. It would clearly be a crime against truth and justice to charge a heretic, or a persecutor of the Church, with bad deeds which he had never committed. But this is not the only way of making him out to be blacker than he really was. For if his real crimes are fully set forth, and everything that can be said in his favor is studiously suppressed, the disproportionate delineation of his character is equivalent to a calumny, and the *suppressio veri* carries with it an effective *suggestio falsi*.

But in this matter, we confess, we are not so much concerned with the danger of doing injustice to the memory of heretics or persecutors by exaggerating their errors, or painting them

blacker than they were. While the names of so many great and good men are made a byword and treated with scorn and contumely, we need not be too greatly troubled if the censures passed, for example, on Luther and his writings, are not in exact proportion to his merits, or demerits. But there is another, and a very different, reason for regarding the want of strict historical justice in our treatment of heretics and heretical writings with grave regret and misgiving. To put it briefly, it is not only a due regard for the requirements of historical truth and candid criticism, but yet more a solicitude for the purity and integrity of Catholic teaching that moves us in the matter.

It is a large and a deep subject to discuss at the close of the present paper. And we must be content to touch upon it in a few words. But it may be enough to note that the defense of Catholic Truth involves something that goes far beyond particular controversies with Luther and Calvin and the vindication of ecclesiastical authority against the religious revolution of these latter centuries. In a word, we have to do with the larger question of Divine Providence, of the distribution of grace throughout the world, and the possibility of the salvation of souls among those who are unhappily cut off from the visible body of the Catholic Church. All these deep matters, to name no others, are involved in the historical treatment of the Reformation story. And it is disheartening to notice the narrow party spirit with which some superficial writers approach this grave problem. It would seem as though it mattered nothing to us how far the unhappy Reformers went in their errors, or how much of Catholic truth they retained in their system. Nay, some would even seem to think that the worse we can make them out to be, the better it is for our case, since it gives us a more crushing victory. And, on the other hand, the suggestion that the rupture may have come as the result of a gradual growth of abuses, and a neglect of adequate instruction of the people in religion, is apt to be regarded as an attempt to palliate the crimes of the Reformers. But the real problem to be studied is something broader and deeper than the exact measure of guilt in any one man. And it is only by a patient and dispassionate study of all the available evidence, in the light of the Catholic doctrine on Divine Providence and the distribution of grace, that we can hope

to arrive at any satisfactory solution. To go back to the question with which we set out, there is a strange fallacy involved in the suggestion that there can be any discrepancy or antagonism between Catholic Truth and Historical Truth. Doubtless there are many human systems that cannot afford to face the fierce light of history without some protecting screen or some reflecting medium. And their advocates may well wish to doctor the crude facts and mitigate their force. But the champion of the Catholic Church should not stoop to such unworthy weakness. "Whatever record leaps to light she never shall be shamed." It is her place to live in the light, while those who assail her shall perish in the darkness.

REV. W. H. KENT, O.S.C.,
St. Mary of the Angels,
London, England.

THE PREFACE OF THE "ACTA SANCTORUM"

On the page preceding the text of the first volume of the *Acta Sanctorum*, we find in bold type the following appeal:

> Kind Reader, I beg you not to read the following acts or, if they do not meet with your immediate approval, not to pass hasty judgment upon them until you have given due consideration to what I have set forth in the Preface, particularly in the third chapter.

We may infer from this appeal that Bollandus anticipated the unjust criticism from which the *Acta Sanctorum* would suffer owing to ignorance of the design of the work, and of the authority claimed for its contents. Hence in the Preface he explains in detail the plan he proposed to follow, and the credence the events related deserve, thus making acquaintance with the preface essential to an intelligent understanding of the work, and laying down sound principles of historical writing which the lapse of three centuries has only served to vindicate and strengthen. The length of the preface precludes its presentation as a whole; we venture to give the main elements of the second and third chapters, largely in the words of Bollandus himself, in order to encourage acquaintance with the original, and to create a deeper interest in the *Acta Sanctorum*, an "Opus Magnum," too little appreciated and too seldom invoked.[1]

The second chapter is devoted to an explanation of the order in which the material is to be presented. It is difficult for us to appreciate the problem which confronted Bollandus prior to the publication of the *Acta Sanctorum*. Before him was a vast mass of undigested material. All this had to be appraised, its value in the work fixed, and then a plan evolved by which it might be presented in the most effective manner. Some of his predecessors in the field of hagiography had followed no order at all in giving the lives, some had followed an alphabetical order, some the order of time, and some the order of feasts in the Roman liturgy, writing the lives promiscuously when the feasts of several saints fell on the same day. Bollandus determined to

[1] "Neither of our own great historians of the Middle Ages, Gibbon or Hallam, have as far as we have been able to discover, ever consulted them." GEORGE T. STOKES in the *Contemporary Review*, Vol. xliii (Jan., June, 1883), p. 78.

follow the order of the Roman calendar,[2] and when the feasts of several saints fell on the same day, to follow the order of time, as far as this could be ascertained.

> First on a given day, I recount in the order just explained, the names of the saints revered on that day or whose memory is in any way celebrated, adding, when known, the place where they lived, and the dignity or office they held, *e. g.*, St. Guadentius, Bishop of Novara in Italy; St. Leo the Tribune, Martyr, in Bulgaria. By this method it is possible to see, at one glance, the saints treated on that day and the order in which they are treated.

Next he placed the names of saints whose lives are omitted or deferred to another day. When a saint has not been duly canonized or declared a saint by popular acclaim, before the process of canonization was introduced, his life is omitted but the name is given. Bollandus admits that he is liable to err and probably has erred in this matter and appeals for correction. The occurrence of several feasts of the same saint made it necessary to confine the life to one day, and on other days to give merely the name of the saint, with a reference to the day on which the life is given.

The Preface then continues as follows:

> In the third place come the prefaces, or prolegomena, the dissertations preceding the individual lives. In these I set forth the place in which each saint enjoys particular veneration, where he was born, or where he spent his life, or the place which he has hallowed with his relics. I indicate the time in which he lived, from definite proofs where they are available. I establish the public recognition of his sanctity, from the acts of canonization, from Martyrologies, the testimony of ancient writers, churches dedicated to his memory, authorized translations of relics and from other remains. I mention by whom the life was written, at what time, by whom it was approved and cited, and from whom it

[2] This order is opposed by L. Duchesne in the *Bull. Critique* (June, 1888): "Le premier obstacle, c'est l'ordre même de la publication, qui suit le calendrier au lieu de grouper les souvenirs hagiographiques suivant les temps et les lieux. Il est ainsi presque impossible de réunir et de comparer des textes, des traditions, tout à fait analogues de provenance et de formation qui s'éclaireraient par leur rapprochement même. Deux saints du même temps et du même pays, qui ont eu peut-être le même biographe, ou, en tout cas, des biographes étroitment apparentes d'esprit, sont exposés, pour peu que l'un mort le 1er avril, l'autre le 1er octobre, à passer à deux cents ans de distance devant le tribunal de la critique Bollandienne. C'est la loi de l'ouvrage: 'dura lex sed lex.' Dans cent ans seulement, quand il sera fini, les arrière-neveux des Bollandistes actuels pourrant y changer quelque chose." The calendar order is eloquently defended by Pitra, *Etudes sur les Bollandistes*, Chapter VI.

was secured.[3] On this last head (since I consider it of the greatest value as a testimony of gratitude and an earnest of good faith) I take especial care to publish no life at all, without specifying from what church or convent it was received, expressing also the names of individuals who loaned manuscripts or by their own hand transcribed the acts even of one Saint from the manuscripts of others. Some preferred that the lives they had prepared for the public be brought to light in this bulky work, rather than range about separately as on a fragile bark; to them justly belongs the credit as likewise to those who translated the lives or miracles of saints from Greek or some other foreign tongue. I take especial care to specify what I found in the effects of Rosweydus, and I do this the more scrupulously since there have been some who thought or at least tried to convince others, that no life has been published by me which had not previously been secured by him. Those friends know better who supplied most of the material after his death, and daily supply it. A considerable part of the work or rather the whole of it is due to him, as he collected much material and originated the work, a thing which might not have occurred to me or which the superiors of my order might not have allowed me to undertake. . . . . .

In the fourth place I publish the lives, in the original form in which they were composed by the authors, carefully compared with the original manuscripts when they were available. If they did not exist originally in Latin, I specify who translated them; where I do not specify this, and they have been translated from Greek, Italian, French, Spanish or German, they have been translated by me. If several lives of a saint exist hitherto unpublished, particularly when written by men of note, I publish them all here unless they are compendiums one of another. When I am in possession of the original acts, I generally omit the accounts of Metaphrastes and recent writers.

To these lives and miracles I subjoin short notes, where the need arises, by which are shown the more important variant readings noted in the manuscripts. If the names of cities or other places occur which do not seem sufficiently explained in the text, I briefly note where they are situated. If there are any foreign words, or words little used and hence obscure, I explain them briefly. If there is any point of time differing from the accepted chronology, or which does not seem quite clear, I explain it if it has not been done in the prolegomena. If there is anything not in agreement with the decisions of theologians, I either give an explanation, or, as far as I may, excuse it, or even point out how it may be corrected. Finally when other acts of the Saint exist written by

[3] *Acta Sanctorum*, Vol. vii, of October, Page v, d: "Servavimus quoque religiose et porro servabimus quam sibi praescripserat regulam Bollandus (xxviii) ut quae citaret auctorum loca, ipse vidisset, nihil aliena fide proferret; si auctores non fuissent ad manum, apud quem eos citatos reperisset, indicaret."

other authors or related by historians, in addition to the life which I publish, I advise whether there is anything omitted here or not in agreement.

The advisability of adding these notes was questioned by many, and on the ground that they would be displeasing to learned men, Bollandus was induced to curtail them for the first four days.

Then . . . I began to consider for whom I was publishing this work. Did I wish only the most learned men to peruse it? and not rather the entire body of educated men? . . . If I wished only men like Petavius and Sirmondus to read my works, it would be sufficient to have only ten or twelve copies executed, for there are not now and perhaps for a long time will not be ten men of equal learning.

After a few remarks on the technique and style of the work and the need of a supplementary volume,[4] a section is devoted to the question of indices.

Writers who frame appropriate indices derive the most abundant and the most gratifying return from their labors. Readers who have not leisure to peruse the entire work determine from the indices what they can derive thence for their own purpose; those who have read the work, are aided by them in finding certain points which they need, and which they do not remember with sufficient accuracy. Rosweydus promised thirteen indices gathered into one separate volume embracing all the months. The plan of giving each volume its own index appealed more to me, since it is very annoying to be compelled to take up another volume to find something noted in the index. Finally since all the volumes do not come out together, if the earlier volumes were entirely without indices, there would be cause to fear that the advantage of the indices would be little or nothing. There are in all six indices, but they embrace practically the thirteen of Rosweydus. First the index of saints in alphabetical order, not of all the saints of whom mention is made in the entire work, or in the particular volume, but only of those whose feasts are celebrated on the days which the volume includes, or whose feasts are recorded and set forth by us. Not merely the name is given but the day which is hallowed by his memory is prefixed. Then the rank or state in life, the office or triumph of each is indicated, whether they were monks, bishops, widows, abbotts, priests, soldiers, martyrs, etc., and finally the place which they made famous by their lives or by their deaths, or the translation thither of their relics, or the glory of their miracles, *e. g.*, XIII, Hilary, Bishop of Poitiers, in France; XIV, Accursius, of the Order of Minors, Martyr, in Mauretania.

[4] The need is now filled concurrently with the publication of the *Acta Sanctorum* by the *Analecta Bollandiana*, begun in 1882, and now being resumed by the Bollandists after the recent world war. See pp. 334–342 of this issue.

In this index are also contained the details of authorship and a short conspectus of the life of each saint.

> The second is the chronological index, a sort of prelude to the more accurate work on chronology I have in mind. In this are embraced by centuries the chief dates of the saints in each volume. . . . These two indices are prefixed to the work since they afford a guide to readers in using the text intelligently. The other indices are placed after the work.

The first of these is the historical, including the names of all individuals (except the names of saints whose lives are given) found in the volume, the second the topographical, containing the names of places mentioned, with the exception of those generally known, the third the grammatical, containing foreign or obscure words, the fourth, the moral, containing material for use in sermons or moral discourses. The chapter ends with an explanation of the things he purposely avoided in the work, and a forecast engaging in its optimism, of the works he intended to compose on the completion of the *Acta*.

From the third chapter of the preface we learn the historical method Bollandus proposed to follow in the *Acta Sanctorum*.

> I promise, [he writes], to publish whatever I have found committed to writing concerning the lives of the saints, to add nothing, to change nothing on my own responsibility, to abridge nothing, but to publish everything without curtailment or alteration, as far as I am able. . . . If there is anything which can be refuted by the universal authority of reliable witnesses, and which I can declare from the whole form and manner of narration, to be invented, I omit it, not failing however, to advise the reader. . . . In many lives it happens that though certain things seem contradictory, they cannot be refuted absolutely, since they are not in opposition to the mysteries of the Christian religion, or other authoritative accounts of approved credibility. I publish these therefore, explaining, as far as I can, what belief they merit.
>
> Since an important element in the trustworthiness of an account is the identity of the author, I shall here set forth of what character I should desire them to be who wrote the acts of the saints, and the character of many who did write, employing a method very liable to error. I shall then determine to which class my accounts belong, and whether men may not justly scoff at what does not suit them, and class it with fables.
>
> To the first and highest category of historical writing (I speak not of those who derive their material from on High, either by direct inspiration of God, or by dictation or instruction through an angel or other heavenly agent, I speak of those who write after the manner common to mortals), to this then, the leading class, belong those who commit to writing events at which they were present and which they

saw enacted. . . . They hold the second place who have not themselves seen what they relate, but have received it from men who viewed it with their own eyes. . . . The third class is composed of those who relate not what they have received from the eye-witnesses themselves, but from those to whom the eye-witnesses related it. In the fourth class must be placed those who have collected their facts from historians who belong to one of the classes enumerated, or from reliable remains of donations, wills, agreements, or from other accounts. All these assuredly deserve credence, provided they are upright men, of discretion, and provided their writings are incorrupt and unfalsified. If you suspect that a man who writes that he was present at an event, was not sufficiently free from the desire to deceive, either because he was a heretic, or an obstinate partisan of the side he advocates, it would be rash and ill-considered to place unreserved faith in him. This is the reason why Eusebius, Socrates, Zozomen, and Palladius frequently are not believed, because they took sides with heretics or schismatics, or certainly with factions and sometimes advance their cause with the pen. . . .

If all the extant writings on the saints were of such a character that they could be reduced to these four classes, I would not have to expend much effort in estimating their credibility. There are some, however, of a worse character so that one might well doubt what belief should be attached to them. All the acts of the saints of old were not written, and of what were written, some have been destroyed, some lost, some corrupted and changed. Sometimes rulers have not allowed the acts of martyrs to be committed to writing and sometimes no one was present with sufficient zeal for religion to secure them or with sufficient knowledge to write them.

This is true not only of the acts of the martyrs but also of the acts of other saints. The deeds of many were not committed to writing immediately after their departure from life, either because envy interfered, or because they were not immediately invoked in prayer, or because the rulers of the Church forbade them to be hastily written and spread abroad or because a suitable writer was lacking. What was faithfully written down in olden times, particularly the acts of the martyrs, was probably scattered and destroyed by the fatal decrees of Diocletian. . . . It must not be concluded that only the sacred scriptures were consigned to the flames at that time, but all writings tending to advance and strengthen the Christian religion, incite piety, and encourage constancy. Since the sacred scriptures were in the hands of many, copies of them could easily be saved, but not thus with the copies of other books which were kept by the bishop alone or by the custodians of the sacred fabric. As soon as the edicts were suddenly and unexpectedly promulgated, Eusebius tells us that hands were laid on the bishops and holy men; the rest could conceal what they wished and withdraw it from the rage of godless men. Much of what survived at Rome and elsewhere perished later by the invasion and devastation of

barbarians, or by the chance burning of houses and town. In this manner many lives of other saints which it is evident were once correctly written, also perished.

This is the reason why the belief in many lives is now uncertain. In the first place since the original acts of the saint were destroyed, but the names of saints survived and were adorned with miracles, it became necessary to write their acts some centuries after their departure from life, either from old accounts or since they generally did not exist, from the mere vocal accounts of the people, handed down by their ancestors. But as Saint Augustine says: "History sometimes lies, but much more frequently tradition." It must be employed, however, when no other material is at hand, but there is need of discretion. When this is used sincerely and carefully, facts are established with honor to the saints and fruit to mortals. It must conduce to the increase of their glory that the celebrated deeds which are on the tongues of men be written down seriously and carefully, and it must be of utility to many to be able to read what saints are revered even in the most remote places, what the opinion of men on them is, and what the memory of their deeds.

After a digression on the subject of miracles, he resumes:

To return to the subject, many lives have been thus written from the folklore, of many ancient martyrs of many of the apostles of Gaul, of many of the saints of the nations just mentioned and, strange to say, of many Italians. The learned men who collected these acts had nothing to follow but folklore, which was said to have come down from ancient times. If they happened upon some ancient document, however meagre, like a light held out to a hopeless man in a dense fog, by it they directed the entire course of their narration. Some, however, make so much of this ancient folklore as to place it on a par with the apostolic traditions, calling old popular persuasions, traditions, though they differ essentially. The apostolic traditions do not rest upon popular report but upon solid proofs, though handed down by word of mouth and not in writing. Popular traditions, however, often unworthy of the belief of children, resting on a slender or even a false basis, are greatly increased by additions but gain little strength by these additions. Even when facts are narrated by a trustworthy man they are wrongly understood by some, and related in a worse fashion to others, so that they travel very far with added errors. It is a peculiarity of rumor that it acquires strength as it progresses, and is more tenacious of the false and the wrong, than of the true and the right. Often what I have related to another returns to me the same day amplified in many ways and so changed that I do not recognize what originated from myself, until by questioning the author of what was related, I learn what was added and by whom. If with learned men of the highest reputation for sincerity, some vagary of thought or some unwarranted interpretation causes this, what will occur in the case of an unlearned and uncultured people?

Some acts not composed from vague, popular rumor but written learnedly and with authority at one time, have been tampered with later to injure the Catholic religion or the character of the saint. This makes necessary a careful collection of all the ancient manuscripts to detect the error. Even if they are in agreement they must be investigated in the light of the teaching of the Church and if there is any opposition they must be rejected.

Other writers have undertaken to abbreviate the original acts of the saints. They restricted the accounts of virtues to a few words, but on occasion amplified the accounts of miracles, including descriptions and explanations which throw the whole account into question. This is particularly intolerable if copyists, without any literary equipment, insert circumstances of this kind or discard what they consider common and trite.

Finally lives have been entirely invented, some, of wicked men, by heretics and some by Catholics as an exercise of style. Heretics have not only corrupted the acts of saints, to claim them for themselves, they have proclaimed saints the most wicked men of their persuasion, and declared their just deaths martyrdom. . . . This is a common form of deceit with sectaries.

Other lives have been written by Catholics, containing not the deeds which the saints performed, but what they could have performed. It has been an ancient custom and it exists today, for men not without learning, to compose the lives of kings and heroes, and relate their wonderful exploits, with fictitious names, in order that readers may be taken with a desire to read them further. This may be tolerated if the names are entirely fictitious, but do they not impose upon serious readers when they attach to a king who is well known deeds which he never even thought of performing? This foolish writing dulls the force of the exploits worthy of praise. To me it seems the height of boldness for men unseasonably funny, not to say impious, to dare thus to trifle with the deeds of holy men. Thus a silly trickster falsely assuming the name of Turpinus, a holy bishop, wrote the life of Charlemagne, thus also the acts of the martyr Reynoldus and others have been soiled by the license of a scurrilous style. There are others not deserving perhaps such bitter censure who offer directions to correct morals and excite piety under the name of a saint in order to give them greater force and cover them with the honey of most attractive fiction to insure more ready acceptance. I do not approve of this kind of writing, since readers form a false idea of saints, or if it is stated that the account is fictitious, suspect that the other deeds of the saint are likewise fictitious, and sometimes doubt whether those who are venerated as saints ever existed. Even if this should not occur, a falsehood should never be used as an incentive to piety. God is Truth.

> All untruth is hateful to Him, whether of word, deed or script. Any one who desires to exercise his pen has at hand excellent material in sacred and profane history.
>
> With these principles established, some one may ask to what class of historical writing my work belongs. . . . I say then, first, that there are in this work no lives which any one may have the slightest suspicion of being entirely imaginary, as they are always based on the testimony of some Martyrology, or other unassailable authority;[5] second, that there are no lives which by any probability were corrupted by heretics or other men with evil intent.

Then he enumerates the various classes to which the lives belong.

1. Those related by eyewitnesses. "These were not deliberately invented after many centuries, but were consigned to writing by wise men who had seen the events, and most faithfully preserved them to our own day. Neither should captious men accuse the monks of being stupid and lazy, men by whose industry, to tell the truth, not only the sacred documents of ancient piety, but all the monuments of ancient learning have come down to us, as even many heretics themselves do not deny."

2. "There are in this work many authors who did not themselves see what they related, or did not see everything, (though those whom we call eyewitnesses did not so carefully view everything that they also did not learn from others), but learned most from the accounts of those who saw them enacted."

3. "There are also several who wrote not what they saw or heard from eyewitnesses, but, since they were separated by a long

---

[5] A change in the character of the lives admitted and an extension of the textual criticism was introduced by Father De Smedt in Volume 1 for November (1887). *Praef.* "Quibus in rebus duo sunt observanda per quae hic primus tomus mensis Novembris a multis praecedentibus tomis distinguitur ac reliqui, si Deo placet, distinguentur. Primo quidem omnia acta et documenta manuscripta, quae de sancto cujus est causa, reperire potuimus, operi inseruntur. Non tantum acta sincera, sed etiam interpolata, apocrypha, et fabulosa, ita ut quidquid de sancto per seculorum decursum sub forma actorum aut vitarum scriptum noverimus, cum lectore communicemus. . . . Alterum signum huic tomo quasi proprio charactere impressum, mutata est ratio edendi sanctorum Acta et Vitas, quam moderni temporis usui atque exigentiae informiorem reddidimus. Quae enim numquam antea in lucem publicam edita fuerant, ea non ex fide unius alteriusve codicis manuscripti quem vicina aliqua bibliotheca aut proprium museum suppeditabat, edendi curavimus, sed omnium antiquorum codicum quos invenire potuimus subsidio cunctas unius textus varias lectiones colligimus, collectasque exemplo principali subjunximus."

distance what they had learned from men to whom the eyewitnesses had related it."

4. "Finally there are many who revised what was written by writers of the above class, in a new order and a new style, or who composed the lives of saints from old and authentic documents, or from reliable historians. These I imitate whenever I do not find the acts of any saint, but only their memory found in the fathers, or historians or martyrologies."

"I do not think that belief in these lives can easily be destroyed by anyone, except that perhaps not a few things may occur to the reader which may be added to what I have published."

5. "There are some lives written from popular report a long time after the death of the saint, or from documents not so authentic or reliable."

6. "The last class of lives are those contracted from the original, or certainly interpolated in various places. This indeed has sometimes been cleverly done by learned men, but I should prefer that they had made separate notes of their observations, additions and corrections, which they have woven into the original account. This class has a very wide range, and like the former, demands a close examination."

Some, the Preface states, do not reject all the lives; they attack the last two classes. They declare that they cherish the lives of the saints, meditate upon them, and derive from them much to excite virtue in their own minds and in the minds of others. But they desire none to be edited that are not carefully investigated and based entirely on truth, which can not only be destroyed, but not even impugned. . . . Men who think thus should devote their zealous labor to illustrating or composing anew the lives of the saints, or rouse up others like themselves, men of sharp and accurate judgment, accomplished in writing, to apply themselves to restoring the acts to their former splendor.

> If this may scarcely be hoped, and if by the total destruction of the legitimate acts of certain saints, only those exist written from uncertain popular report, or from legends crudely interpolated . . . and if it is certain that they were considered saints by the consent of several centuries, revered with gifts, votive tablets, and rites by the order, or with the approval or at least with the knowledge of the Roman Church the judge of holy things and the mistress of holiness, what shall we do with acts of this kind? You wish them omitted, or cast into obscurity, or

rather into the fire. Rightly so if there is in them anything in opposition to the orthodox faith or the right regulation of morals. And would that those who are so strict with the lives of the saints would visit with the same censure or rather exterminate very many books which entail a not light corruption of morals.

If there is anything in the acts which is not in opposition to traditional revealed doctrine, and which does not seem to corrupt the minds of readers with the lure of vice, but which is in opposition to all the historians or to several highly approved ones of the time in which the saint lived, whatever it is I allowed it to be expunged or myself made a note on it. But if there is anything which does not agree with only one ancient account, it is not just to prescribe it for that reason, since writers, ancient and modern, frequently disagree among themselves, even those who write the events of their own day, and who are present at the events themselves. I do not see why more reliance should be placed on Ammianus Marcellinus, the enemy of the Christians, or another of the same character, than on any Christian writer however crude and unskilled. Though the latter might be, as they say, too credulous, the former cleverly keeps silence through envy, or viciously minimizes the glories of our saints.

Suppose it were evident that the lives whose falsity you suspect most were written by a contemporary of the saints, an eyewitness of all the events, a good man, a Christian or a pagan, but in the same manner in which they now exist, would you then reject and condemn them? Not at all, you say. But they are written without elegance. But with truth. Simply and without finish. But sincerely. What they relate is uncertain. But see, you say, it is attested to. They should have been cast in a more orderly fashion. The author would not or could not. What then do you think? Should they be published or given to the flames? Publi hed, I hear. Some concession at least must be made to antiquity. Truth does not need disguise or adornment It is sufficient unto itself, to attract good men, bare, and without external embellishment. But the places do not agree nor the dates and writers of the same period do not mention events like this. You will consider that some explanation must be employed or some excuse, as a solution, rather than that you should entirely reject what is clearly evident was composed by an author of this kind. Employ now the same excuses, explanations, and solutions and lives of this kind will have their proper authority and probability. . . . Suppose there is a mistake in a place, a date, or a similar circumstance, must the whole account therefore be suppressed? Even though they are eyewitnesses who make this mistake in the narration? O severe judge! If the law were laid down that it was not allowed for anything false or improbable to be in history, no history would be written, no old writings would be tolerated, except those dictated by God.

You say that heretics will laugh at these things. What then! They laugh at the most sacred mysteries of our faith. They even laugh at

some books we know to have issued from the Holy Spirit; they laugh at many praiseworthy acts of pious people; they laugh at lives written by eyewitnesses the wisest and the holiest. We do not write for them. It would not be difficult to confound their impudence, but they are not worth it. . . . We write for pious and upright men to whom these lives will furnish an incentive to virtue. But all heretics will not laugh at my labor. There are among them certain lovers of antiquity, and hence less removed from the kingdom of God, who will rejoice that many things, however, covered with dust are being brought to light, things which they may use for the improvement of the human literature they are forming, in Italy, Phil. Cluverius, in England, Wm. Camden, Usher, Vossius, Meursius, etc. Would that by this reading their minds may some day be moved to give their hands and hearts and pens to the service of Catholic love and harmony.

Catholics themselves will disdain them. Yes, as people too generously fed with honey. . . . If any have stomachs so delicate that these lives will cause distress, let them refrain from reading them; they have other things to read. All foods do not agree with all guests. . . . The reader has my opinion about each life. If anything does not seem suited to his taste, he can pass it by. . . . If anyone's taste is too delicate it should be corrected, lest if it persevere he should refuse healthful even necessary medicine. Finally, if this argument has any value, how many become weary of sermons, the use of the sacraments, the reading of pious books, and of prayer? Must these then be withdrawn and abandoned? The mind must rather be aroused and turned in the opposite direction in order that it may attain its proper equilibrium. No man who approves everything, no man who approves nothing, can be free from error. Ignatius the founder of our Society, once lost his relish for books which treat of sacred things; he demanded silly books, which dealt with wars, even imaginary ones, and of things suited to the pleasure-loving character of the world in order to distract his mind by reading and beguile the weariness of sickness. When he overcame this disgust he could scarcely be satisfied with the reading of the same pious books. Finally he bore the fruit, to the advantage of the entire Church. This will also happen in this case perhaps, taking its rise from that from which the mind greatly shrinks.

You say "It cannot at least be denied that many ridiculous things are contained in the acts." I am not so austere as to deny myself laughter, or all signs of hilarity, yet though I am engaged daily in these acts, I never remember having been moved to laughter by them. I admit that the stubborn efforts of evil spirits, to weaken the constancy of the saints in prayer and other virtues are ridiculous, but I deny that it is ridiculous to relate them. If any one cannot restrain himself, let him break into smiles and laughter if he wishes. But he must not think that from this folly of his is deduced an argument of any value in affecting these acts which in the case of many more elicit salutary tears as they

ponder on the great deeds of a saint, accomplished by divine aid, deeds of men of the same rank and station as ourselves, cowardly degenerates, though so far removed in time and place.

Granted that they are not ridiculous, surely many things are incredible. Why so? Because they exceed the accustomed range of human events. Are they declared to have been done by human effort? and not by God or His help? What is impossible to Him? If Livy or Sallust related that this had happened, I suppose you would believe it but would declare that it was done by means of demons. Have they more power than the immense divinity of God? So if anything wonderful is related as done by Him, you would pronounce it incredible, if by them you would immediately have faith in it? You say God could do this, but whence is it proven that He did do it? Whence would it be proven if Livy related it? By human faith, I suppose, which has place here. You ask where is my proof that God did anything that is related? Where is your proof that He did not do it? I produce an authority who asserts it; have you one who denies it? If you have, whose statement is more convincing? If you have not, and admit it could be done, consider if it is not rash to deny unreasonably that it was done. You say there was no reason for working a miracle. How do you know tnis? It is not written. Are all the causes of everything written? One perhaps is given, but it is not approved by you. I suppose you have scrutinized all the designs of God. You do not know, you do not know the goodness and munificence of Him on Whom you place bounds, beyond which it would be unbecoming for Him to gratify mortals.

You fear that these lives will beget false ideas, troublesome errors, and almost foolish superstitions which, once thoroughly implanted and established, cannot be rooted out even when the truth is discovered and proclaimed on the best authority. This fear is groundless. Certain things were lately corrected in the Martyrology. Who did not embrace the truth promptly and without reserve? It is not a dangerous error to be ignorant of the birth or date of a saint, or some particular of his life, some of which details even the sacred scripture conceals. . . . Consider the discussions among the French not on a miracle or two, but on saints who are publicly venerated. Learned men held the opinion that Denis the apostle of Paris was sent to France about 250 A.D. and profess a public veneration for him. Others hold that he never existed, and in his stead publicly venerate Denis the Areopagite. Is this a trifling controversy? One side must be in error. Yet the prelates of the Church are not disturbed, nor even the Roman Pontiff, the head and father and ruler of all, since the error is not of such a character as to affect piety or any other virtue. That holy bishop is not offended because the honors due to him are offered to the Areopagite, nor does the Areopagite attempt to snatch them from him since both know that all honor to them redounds to the glory of God. If some day it should come to light that the people of Paris were without question converted not by the Areopagite but

by a younger man, they will readily give their assent to the truth, released from the darkness of centuries.

This remarkable Preface, which must always have a place in the history of historical method, and of which we have translated only those parts descriptive of the method followed by Bollandus, concludes with the following vindication of his work: "Finally the Church orders that certain lives be corrected and you bring them to light. In what does correction consist? In hiding a thing in darkness, sinking it in the mire, destroying it by fire? and not rather in taking care that what seems crooked and is so be made straight and known so; this is what I do. I am confident that my work will be approved by the whole Church, and particularly by the moderator of all, the Roman See. I designate the lives I think legitimate; those I think deficient and to what extent, and those that should be corrected and in what way, but always with so much diffidence, that I admit it is not often clear to me how the errors I suspect should be corrected and appeal to others to suggest what appears to be more to the point."

REV. PATRICK A. COLLIS, PH.D.,
The Catholic University of America,
Washington, D. C.

THE MARTYRDOM OF FATHER JUAN DE SANTA MARÍA

I. Introduction

The recent discovery of two important manuscripts gives occasion to discuss anew an interesting and much debated point in the history of Spanish exploration in New Mexico. I refer in general to the Rodríguez-Chamuscado Expedition, 1581-82, but more in particular to the circumstances surrounding the martyrdom of Father Juan de Santa María in 1581. The manuscripts referred to are: (1) An account, or *relación*, of the Rodríguez expedition, written while the expedition was in progress, by a member of the party, Hernan Gallegos; (2) A commentary on, or *crónica* of, the early exploring expeditions of New Spain and New Mexico, written by Baltasár de Obregón, a man experienced in frontier exploration, and a contemporary of Gallegos.[1]

Hernan Gallegos, a native of Seville,[2] went with the Rodríguez party in the capacity of scrivener and explorer.[3] He was therefore well qualified by his position to write the above *Relación*, which, without doubt, is the "book, written by his hand, in which he gives an account of all this journey which he has made, and which he has delivered to His Excellency," as he stated in his testimony to the viceroy upon the return of the expedition to Mexico.[4] Gallegos says concerning his *Relación*, "todo lo en el

[1] Hernan Gallegos, *Relación y concudto de el viage y subseso que Francisco Chamuscado con ocho soldados sus companeros hizo en el descubrimiento del Nuevo Mexico en Junio de* 1581. (Archivo General de Indias, Patronato, 1-1-3/22); Baltasar de Obregon, *Crónica comentario ó relaciones de los descubrimientos antiguos y modernos de N. E. y del Nuevo Mexico*, 1584. (Archivo General de Indias, Patronato 1-1-3/22). Use of these documents, copies of which are in the Edward E. Ayer Collection in the Newberry Library, Chicago, was made by Herbert E. Bolton in his *Spanish Exploration in the Southwest;* but otherwise they have never been used in any form whatsoever. It was the writer's good fortune to be the first to make a detailed study of the expedition with which they deal, and with these documents as a basis, a master's thesis was prepared in Dr. Bolton's seminar in the University of California, May, 1917.

[2] Obregon, 93. The Gallegos and Obregón documents referred to are to be found in the writer's thesis, *The Rodríguez Expedition into New Mexico*, 1581-82. All references to the *Declaración* of Bustamante, the *Declaración* of Barrado, the *Relación Breve* of Escalante and Barrado, and the *Relación* of Espejo, and the *Report of the Viceroy*, are to be found in Bolton, *Spanish Exploration*, which contains the English translation of the documents.

[3] Gallegos, *Relación*, 3a; 81.

[4] Gallegos, *Declaración* (*Col. Doc. Inéd.*, XV), 95.

contenido es verdad," and indeed this may be assumed, "for it was written while he was passing through that land."[5] That the account was written while the expedition was in progress is substantiated by another statement of the author, "and so going in the service of the expedition, in the little time that I had, I wrote the account of the expedition and the notable happenings that took place on it."[6] Gallegos claims to have written the *Relación* not only to perform his duties as scrivener of the expedition, but also, as he says, "to aid and encourage many persons of New Spain."[7]

Baltasár de Obregón, the author of the *Crónica* noted above, had been a member of the Ibarra exploring expeditions in Sinaloa and Sonora (1567–1570). It is quite evident that the major portion of his account of the Rodríguez expedition was taken from Gallegos's *Relación*. This is supplemented, however, by much first-hand information which Obregón had secured concerning both the Rodríguez and the Espejo expeditions. His purpose in writing the account was, as he states, "to serve your majesty in seeing, studying, and exploring, five hundred leagues of land beyond the Province of San Felipe de Nuevo Mexico."[8] In other words, it was to promote further exploration.

These new documents, taken with other contemporary evidence, prove indubitably that Father Santa María was killed by the Indians of the Sierra Morena, or Sandía Mountains, *prior to the return of the soldiers* to Mexico, and not after the departure of the soldiers, as is commonly represented.[9] They prove also

[5] *Ibid.*

[6] GALLEGOS, *Relación*, 5.

[7] *Ibid.*, 81.

[8] OBREGON, 148.

[9] Hitherto our sources concerning the Rodríguez expedition were the following: (1) The testimony given in Mexico to the viceroy by the returned soldiers of the expedition, Gallegos, Bustamante, and Barrado, 1582 (*Col. Doc. Inéd.*, XV, 80-97); (2) The report of the viceroy to the king, based upon the above depositions, 1583 (*Col. Doc. Inéd.*, XV, 97-100); (3) The *Relation* of Antonio de Espejo, 1583 (*Col. Doc. Inéd.*, XV, 101-126), upon which is based the Espejo account as found in Mendoza's *History of China;* (4) Father FRANCISCUS GONZAGA'S *De Origine Seraphicae Religionis Franciscanae*, 1587, which has been cited by Father Engelhardt (*Franciscan Herald*, July, 1919, p. 288, note 24), but otherwise has escaped notice. I consulted the work in the British Museum, in London; (5) MENDIETA'S *Historia Eclesiastica Indiana*, a notable work written at the end of the sixteenth century; (6) ZARATE SALMERON'S *Relación de todas las cosas que en el Nuevo Mexico*, 1626.

that Santa María separated from the exploring party in opposition to the wishes of the soldiers and the religious; and, finally, that instead of deserting the friars, as they have been accused, the soldiers were eminently successful in exploring a wide expanse of New Mexican territory. Before entering upon a discussion of the points in question, a brief account of the expedition, based on the new documents, will be of value.

II. Sketch of the Rodríguez Expedition

One of the Spanish outposts on the northern frontier of New Spain in 1580 was Santa Bárbara, or, as it is sometimes called, the Mines of Santa Bárbara. Here lived a small group of men, who were very desirous of advancing into the unexplored territory beyond the Christian habitations. Information concerning that land had been obtained by various means, principally by expeditions made short distances beyond Santa Bárbara against marauding Indians. In addition, the story of Cabeza de Vaca had left a vivid impression upon the minds of the frontiersmen.

This interest culminated in the granting, by the viceroy, of a license to Fray Agustin Rodríguez to visit the pueblos of New Mexico. He was authorized to take with him as many priests as he desired, and twenty soldiers, "for the safety of their persons, and in order that they might be able to preach the Holy Gospel."[10] The commission to raise soldiers was granted to Francisco Sanchez, commonly called "Chamuscado," who in turn chose eight men with whom to make the expedition.[11] For the conversion of the natives two other religious were named. They were Fathers Francisco López and Juan de Santa María. All three friars belonged to the Order of Saint Francis and came from the monastery of San Francisco, in the city of Mexico. Father Francisco López, who was named as Father Superior, was a native of Seville, and came of noble parentage. Father Juan de Santa María, a native of Catalonia, went as companion to Father López. Both were "theólogos," or members of the theological college. Fray Agustín, a native of Niebla,[12] was a Franciscan lay-brother. All

[10] *Report of the Viceroy*, 158.

[11] GALLEGOS, *Relación*, 3a; 6-7.

[12] OBREGON, 92-93. Gallegos and Obregón state that Rodríguez was a native of Ayamonte, and that Santa María came from Valencia. I find, however, that TORQUEMADA, VETANCURT, WADDING (*Scriptores Ordinis Minorum*), and GONZAGA, agree that Rodríguez was born in Niebla, and that Santa María was a Catalan.

sources agree in extolling the learning and piety of the two "theólogos," and especially Father Santa María, who possessed, in addition to his other attainments, a profound knowledge of astronomy.[13]

Preparations for the expedition were made at Santa Bárbara. The three religious and nine soldiers were provided with good offensive arms, supplies, horses, and articles to be bartered among the natives. In addition there accompanied the expedition seventeen Indian servants, two Indian women, and six hundred cattle, goats, sheep, and hogs.[14] Everything was furnished at the expense of the viceroy. The equipment of the expedition makes it appear as though it was intended not merely to explore, but likewise to establish permanent missions, an inference which is borne out by what the friars did in New Mexico.[15]

All arrangements having been completed, the party set forth from Santa Bárbara on June 5, 1581.[16] The route pursued was briefly the following: Down the San Gregorio River to its junction with the Conchos River,[17] thence down the latter river to the confluence of the Conchos and the Río Grande near the present Presidio del Norte.[18] The first leg of the journey of about seventy leagues of desolate and barren land, and the most difficult to cross, was completed in thirty-one days,[19] or on July 6. The Spaniards had guides who conducted them through both the Conchas and Cabri Indian tribes.[20]

Leaving the Conchos-Río Grande junction, the explorers next traveled up the latter river for 121 leagues,[21] which were covered in forty-five days. It was on August 21,[22] that they came to the first inhabited pueblo of New Mexico, called by the

---

[13] Mendieta says "astrology," but he clearly implies astronomy.

[14] OBREGON, 94.

[15] GALLEGOS, *Relación*, 5.

[16] ESCALANTE and BARRADO, 154.

[17] GALLEGOS, *Relación*, 7.

[18] OBREGON, 101.

[19] ESCALANTE and BARRADO, 154.

[20] OBREGON, 103; GALLEGOS, *Relación*, 8.

[21] This is the distance computed from Luxán's account: Diego Pérez de LUXAN, *Entrada que hizo en el Nuevo Mexico, Anton de Espejo en el ano de 82* (Archivo General de Indias, *Estante* 1, *Cajon* 1, *Legajo* 3/22).

[22] They left the junction (Presidio del Norte) on July 6, and arrived at San Felipe on August 21. ESCALANTE and BARRADO, 154-155.

Spaniards San Felipe, and located in the present San Marcial region.[23] The discoverers continued their march up the river, which they called the Guadalquivir, finding many settlements located upon its banks. They named the pueblos that they found and described them, but in a very meager fashion. Some of the pueblos I have been able to locate definitely; of others I have been able to determine the probable location; but still others are quite uncertain.

The progress of the explorers through the Piros and Tigua Indian nations is described in detail in both the Gallegos and Obregón documents. It serves my present purpose, however, to note only that on September 2, 1581, the Spaniards departed from the last of the Tigua pueblos, Cáceres,[24] which has been located on or near the present site of Bernallilo.[25] Two days were spent among the pueblos of the Queres on the Río Guadalquivír; then, having arrived at the mouth of the Santa Fé River, the explorers made their first side-trip up the valley of this stream. Four pueblos were discovered in this valley, the date of the event being September 6.[26]

Upon the arrival of the expedition in the Santa Fé region, Father Juan de Santa María became anxious to return to Christian lands to render a report of all that had been discovered.[27] His determination met with bitter opposition from the religious as well as from the soldiers. They argued that it would not only be foolhardy and dangerous for him to go alone, but that his death would be of serious consequence to those left behind, for it would serve to disillusion the natives, who regarded the Spaniards as immortals. In addition, they said, his report would be but fragmentary, for there remained much of that land to explore. Notwithstanding this opposition, Father Santa María persisted in his plan, and, without the permission

---

[23] "The region of San Marcial not only indicates the southern limit of the pueblos of the sixteenth century, but it seems also that the many-storied pueblo type of architecture at no time extended farther down the Rio Grande Valley," BANDELIER, *Final Report*, II, 252.

[24] GALLEGOS, *Relación*, 65-86.

[25] HACKETT, CHARLES W., *The Location of the Tigua Pueblos of Alameda, Puaray and Sandia*, 1680-1681 (in *Old Santa Fé*, II, 381-391, April, 1915).

[26] GALLEGOS, *Relación*, 49; 65-66; 86.

[27] *Ibid.*, 49.

of his Father Superior, took leave alone, on the Eve of Nuestra Señora, or September 7.[28] Since the pueblos of the Santa Fé, or Atomilco Valley, as it was called by the soldiers, were discovered on September 6, it is certain that Santa María must have set out from that valley and not from Galisteo, as was stated by Zárate Salmerón.[29] He probably passed through Galisteo, however, and the failure of the Indians to tell of the padre's death, when later the explorers went through the Galisteo to the buffalo country, can be attributed to their fear of the Spaniards' vengeance.

After the departure of Santa María the explorers returned to the Río Grande and continued their journey up the river to the Tewa country.[30] Passing through the Tewas, they traveled as far north as Taos,[31] a pueblo of the northern group of the Tiguas. Then, retracing their steps, they went down the Río Grande until they came to the valley of the Galisteo River. From this region, on September 28, they departed toward the east into the buffalo country.[32] After a long and difficult journey over the vast plains, the explorers returned by their former trail to the pueblos of Galisteo.[33]

Here they learned from the natives that Father Santa María had been killed.[34] His departure had occasioned great excitement among the natives, for they feared that he went in quest of more Spaniards. So, on his third day out,[35] after he had gone

---

[28] OBREGON, 142-143.

[29] ZARATE SALMERON, Gerónimo de, *Relación de todas que en el Nuevo Mexico se han visto y sabido asi por mar como por tierra desde el ano de 1538 hasta el de 1626* (in *Doc. Hist. Mex.*, 3d. ser., IV, Mexico, 1856. Translated into English by C. F. LUMMIS, in *Land of Sunshine*, XI, 1899, 336-340).

[30] GALLEGOS, *Relación*, 66.

[31] *Ibid.*

[32] *Ibid.*, 37. OBREGON, 130.

[33] *Ibid.*, 138.

[34] GALLEGOS, *Relación*, 79.

[35] Since Father Santa María left his brother friars on September 7th., the date of his martyrdom would be on or about September 10, 1581. Several clerical writers assign different dates to the deaths of all three friars. VETANCURT (*Menologio*) states that Father Santa María was martyred on June 9, 1581, Father López on December 21, 1581, and Fray Rodríguez on December 28, 1581. ARTURO Á MONASTERIO (*Martyrologium Franciscanum*) gives the same days and months as Vetancurt, but no year. WADDING (*Scriptores Ordinis Minorum*) gives 1580 as the year of the deaths of all three friars. Gonzaga's only reference to the matter (p. 105)

about five leagues, the Tiguas of the Pueblo of San Pablo,[36] in the Sierra Morena, set upon and killed him.[37] Hearing this story, the Spaniards attempted to keep it a secret, for they did not want the natives to learn of their vulnerability.[38] Nevertheless, the natives determined to kill the remaining Spaniards. A conflict was imminent, and was only averted by the intercession of the two friars, who desired to foster the good will of the natives, so that they could remain among them.[39]

Notwithstanding the hostility of the Indians, the Spaniards did not lack the temerity[40] to visit the pueblos as far west as Acoma[41] and Zuni[42] and the Salines[43] to the east of the Manzano Mountains. From the Salines they returned to Puaray, on the Río Grande, near Bernalillo, where preparations were made to return to Mexico. The two religious refused to return with the soldiers, for they were determined to remain among the natives.[44] The soldiers were compelled reluctantly to acquiesce and, after promising to exercise all possible haste in returning to Mexico, and to send back help, they left Puaray on January 31, 1582.[45] Chamuscado died on the way and was buried near Jiménez. The rest arrived safely in Santa Bárbara on May 15, after an absence

---

is that Rodríguez was martyred in 1580. The Gallegos and Obregón documents state clearly that Santa María was killed in September, which disposes of the June dates. Likewise the assigned dates of the deaths of the other two friars are disposed of by Gallegos's statement (p. 73) that the soldiers left the two friars at Puaray on January 31, 1582.

[36] ZARATE SALMERON, *Land of Sunshine*, 341.

[37] GALLEGOS, *Reclación*, 49-50; Obregón, 142-143. The Manzano Mountains have been identified with the Sierra Morena.

[38] *Ibid.*

[39] GALLEGOS, *Relación*, 54-55; Obregón, 146.

[40] The soldiers have been unjustly criticised and branded as cowards, especially by Mendieta (p. 401), who ventures the opinion that Hernando Cortés would not have turned back, as he accuses the soldiers of doing. He blames them for the deaths of the friars, whereas the obstinacy of the friars and their zeal for martyrdom was alone responsible.

[41] "In 1888 Mr. Cushing discovered the name of Francisco Chamuscado on the Inscription rock," BANDELIER, *Final Report*, II, 331. Those annalists who accuse the soldiers of turning back immediately after they reached the Tiguas, are contradicted by this alone. GALLEGOS, *Relación*, 90.

[42] *Ibid.*, 91.

[43] *Ibid.*, 57-58; BUSTAMANTE, 149; ESCALANTE and BARRADO, 157.

[44] BUSTAMANTE, 159; OBREGON 147; GALLEGOS, *Relación*, 71-72.

[45] *Ibid.*, 73.

of nearly eleven months. Leaving their comrades in that villa, Gallegos and Bustamante departed for the city of Mexico, at which place, on May 16, 1582, they went before the viceroy and rendered formal reports of the expedition.

Meanwhile, the two friars left in New Mexico, Rodríguez and López, had been brutally murdered by the natives. Concerning their deaths Gallegos and Bustamante made no mention, for indeed they were entirely ignorant of their fate. Hernando Barrado, one of the soldiers, however, arrived in Mexico City at a later date, and on October 20, gave the viceroy a report concerning the death of the two friars.[46] He stated that when the soldiers returned to Puaray, they left with the religious three Indians: Gerónimo, Francisco, and Andrés. Three months later, while in Santa Barbara, Barrado met Francisco and learned from him that the natives of Puaray had killed Father López, and that, being frightened, Francisco Gerónimo, and Andrés ran away. While they were running they heard outcries in the pueblo, by which they judged that Fray Agustín was being killed also. Barrado testified that Gerónimo gave him the same story as Francisco. Mendieta, Torquemada, Zárate Salmerón, and other annalists give substantially the same version, but with many embellishments and additional details. A year later Espejo learned that the two remaining friars had been killed in Puaray, thus confirming the story.[47] Obregón's sole allusion to this matter is his laconic statement that the Indians killed the friars for the articles that were left with them.[48]

In the foregoing sketch of the expedition the points of especial import to be noted are those attending the martyrdom of Father Santa María, particularly in relation to the subsequent movement of the soldiers and the two remaining friars. The soldiers did not turn back *prior* to the death of Santa María, as writers have maintained, but carried back with them complete knowledge of the affair and reported it to the viceroy. Santa María's action in departing at the time when he did was not only ill-advised, but was strongly opposed by both the soldiers and

---

[46] Barrado, 151-153.
[47] Espejo, *Relation*, 179.
[48] Obregon, 147.

religious. In no other place, so far as I know, is given the exact date of the departure of Santa María for Mexico.

III. The Testimony of Gallegos and Obregon Substantiated by Other Contemporary Accounts

The Gallegos and Obregón manuscripts are so detailed and concise on the above points, and they are so strongly substantiated by other contemporary accounts, both religious and secular (which have been either rejected or overlooked in the past) that their validity cannot be doubted.

1. *The Espejo Account.*—Even without the circumstantial testimony which we have at hand in the Gallegos and Obregón manuscripts, the evidence hitherto available, especially the Espejo *Relation*,[49] should have sufficed to establish a true account of Santa María's martyrdom, but it did not. Prior to the departure of his expedition to New Mexico, Antonio Espejo knew of the death of Santa María, and of the remaining of Rodríguez and López after the return of the soldiers.[50] The Franciscan authorities in Mexico also knew of Santa María's death, for Espejo says, "And thus they remained with the three Indian boys and a half-breed, whereat the Order of Saint Francis was greatly grieved, regarding it as certain that the Indians would kill the *two* friars and those who remained with them."[51] The Franciscans, therefore, wished to succor the religious, and for this purpose Father Beltrán offered himself. This information was verified later, Espejo tells us, for when his party came to the Tiguas, in the Pueblo of Pualas (Puaray), they found that the Indians of that province had killed Father López and Fray Rodríguez. Later, in the province of the Maguas, Espejo learned that Father Santa María had been killed "*before Francisco Chamuscado went to the pacified country.*"[52] Thus the avowed purpose of the Espejo expedition, which entered New Mexico one year after the Rodríguez party, was to learn the fate of Rodríguez

[49] *Relación que yo Antonio Espejo con catorce soldados y un religioso de el orden de San Francisco a las Provincias y problaciones de la Nueva Mexico* (*Col. Doc. Inéd.*, XV, 101–126. Translated into English in BOLTON, *Spanish Exploration*, 168–192).

[50] *Ibid.*, 168–169.

[51] *Ibid.*

[52] *Ibid.*, 181.

and López. It seems strange then, after Espejo accomplished the object of his undertaking and rendered his report, that this report, in so far as it relates to the martyrdom of the three friars, should be overlooked or rejected.

This mistake, however, came later, for the Espejo *Relation* found contemporary acceptance in being made the basis of "El Viage que hizo Antonio de Espejo," as found in Mendoza's *History of China*, 1585. Richard Hakluyt, another contemporary, incorporated bodily into his *Voyages* the Mendoza version as based on the Espejo *Relation*.[53] Moreover, in 1586, Hakluyt had printed in Spanish, at his own expense, a small booklet entitled, "El Viage que hizo Antonio de Espejo en el Año de Ochenta y Tres," the Mendoza version. This indicates the importance he attached to this account.[54]

2. *The Gonzaga Account.*—Another contemporary account which substantiates the Gallegos and Obregón manuscripts is Father Francisco Gonzaga's *De Origine Seraphicae Religionis Franciscanae*, published in Rome, 1587. Here is a clerical annalist who likewise gives a true version of the points in dispute. The details of the expedition, and especially the martyrdom of Santa María, are correctly given by Father Gonzaga. In brief we learn the following from his account: Santa María having determined to return to Mexico to give a report concerning the newly discovered lands and the natives, left the soldiers and the two friars, and started upon his journey *alone*. After he had traveled three days, and while sleeping, he was killed by the

[53] "In Hakluyt's *Voyages* is given a version of the Rodríguez Expedition with that of Espejo in Spanish and in English, taken from Gonzalez de Mendoza's *History of China*, edition of Madrid, 1586, which I have not seen. Laet, *Novus Orbis*, took the account from the edition of 1589. I have the Italian edition of 1586 and the Spanish of 1596, neither of which contains this matter. Neither does Brunet, or any other bibliographer that I have consulted, note any such difference in editions, though of course I have no doubt that such a curious difference exists," BANCROFT, *Arizona and New Mexico*, p. 179, note 7.

[54] A copy is to be found in the British Museum, which, I find, differs in no respect whatsoever from the Hakluyt Society edition of Mendoza (London, 1854), or the account to be found in the various editions of Hakluyt's *Voyages*. This seems to remove Bancroft's apprehensions on this matter. (See note 53.) Father Lorenzo Pérez quotes the Espejo *Relation* at length (*Archivo Ibero-Americano*, Año III, Num. XIV, 242–249), but he evidently admits his lack of confidence in his source, for he immediately follows it with contradictory statements from the Torquemada account, and he makes no attempt to criticise these sources.

Indians by having a large stone placed upon him. After the father's death, "the Spanish soldiers who accompanied the friars returned to their land (*i. e.*, Mexico) to render a report to the viceroy concerning their discoveries. But the two friars, López and Agustín, animated by the zeal of saving souls, remained for that task."[55]

3. *The Testimony of the Returned Soldiers and the Report of the Viceroy*, 1582.[56]—The testimony of the returned soldiers, Bustamante, Gallegos, and Barrado, together with the report of the viceroy, corroborates that which has been set forth above. The depositions of these two soldiers merely state that "the religious" (los dichos religiosos) remained in Puaray with the Indian servants when the soldiers returned to Mexico.[57] There is no mention of Father Santa María. In light of what we now know, "los dichos religiosos" refers only to the two friars, López and Rodríguez, and does not include Santa María, as many writers thoughtlessly suppose.[58] It is true that Barrado testified that the Indian Francisco heard outcries (after the murder of López), and judged that "the *rest* of the religious were being murdered,"[59] but this was an error. The justification for this conclusion is the fact that the viceroy, who was conversant with the details of the expedition, and got his information from Gallegos, Bustamante, and Barrado, rendered a true account, based upon the depositions cited above. The viceroy reported to the king that "Fray Agustín Rodríguez decided to remain in one of the pueblos with a companion." And again, "One of the Indians who remained with the friars testified that one had been killed in his presence, and fleeing, he heard an outcry by which he judged that the other friar was being killed."[60]

IV. Erroneous Later Versions

Thus Gonzaga, Espejo, Bustamante, Barrado, and the

[55] Gonzaga, 1279.

[56] *Testimonio dado en Mexico sobre el descubrimiento de doscientas leguas adelante de las Minas de Santa Bárbola, Gobernacion de Diego de Ibarra; cuyo descubrimiento se hizo en virtud de cierta licencia que pidio Fray Augustín Rodríguez y otros religiosos Franciscos. Acompanan relaciones de este descubrimiento y otros documentos. Años de 1582–1583* (*Col. Doc. Inéd.*, XV, 80–100).

[57] Bustamante, 149.

[58] Benjamin Read is one of these. See his *Illustrated History of New Mexico*, p. 13.

[59] Barrado, 152.

[60] *Report of the Viceroy*, 158–159; Bustamante, 149.

viceroy, all contemporary writers, are all in accord with the Gallegos documents. It is curious, therefore, that many later versions, beginning with Mendieta, are either silent on the above points or are in direct contradiction to them. These errors have persisted from the sixteenth century to the present day, from Mendieta and Torquemada to Father Engelhardt. As recently as July, 1919,[61] the author of *Missions and Missionaries of California* commits himself to the version of Mendieta and other early annalists. Father Engelhardt quotes Bolton's *Spanish Exploration in the Southwest*, but fails to note the errors on this point in the older authorities that Bolton corrected. Following is a consideration of these versions and their treatment of the martyrdom of Father Juan de Santa María:

1. *The Mendieta-Torquemada Account.*—Mendieta, who was copied by Torquemada, wrote his *Historia Ecclesiastica Indiana* in 1596. This history, therefore, cannot properly be considered a contemporary account of the Rodríguez expedition. The soldiers are represented by Mendieta as turning back at Puaray, leaving the missionaries to explore one hundred and fifty leagues farther into the Indian country, after which Father Santa María set out alone on his attempt to reach Mexico to make a report and to summon help.[62] After he had traveled three days some Indians took his life in a novel fashion. While he was sleeping beneath a tree, the savages placed a heavy stone upon his head, and then left him to die of suffocation.[63] How this error pertaining to the return of the soldiers prior to the death of Santa María crept into the Mendieta account is indeed puzzling. He may have used the Gonzaga account, which gives the same details concerning Santa María's death, but for some unknown reason Mendieta makes no mention of the fact that the soldiers were cognizant of this affair.

2. *The Zárate Salmerón Account.*—The essence of the Zárate Salmerón account is essentially the same as that of Mendieta, but contains added errors. It is, briefly, the following: The

[61] *Franciscan Herald*, July, 1919.

[62] Why should Father Santa María have found it necessary to return to Mexico to render a report and get assistance if the soldiers preceded him? Their departure would have made his mission unnecessary.

[63] MENDIETA, 401.

soldiers, because they feared that their numbers were too few to venture into the Indian country, deserted the three religious at Puaray, in the Tiguas country. Then the friars, alone and unprotected, proceeded to explore the pueblo region. Finally, having arrived at Galisteo, and witnessing the docility of the Indians, they agreed that one of them should return to inform the prelates in Mexico concerning their discoveries, and to ask for more missionaries. Father Juan de Santa María volunteered for the journey. He was a great astronomer, and calculated by the stars how they might have traveled by a more direct route. He set out behind the range of Puaray (the Sandía Mountains) to go by way of the Salines, and from there to cut straight across to El Paso.[64] In addition to being more detailed than Mendieta, Zárate Salmerón supplies the information that it was the Tanos nation, at Galisteo, where Father Santa María started upon his journey; and that it was the Tiguas of San Pablo who murdered him.[65] It is interesting to note that the Mendieta and Zárate Salmerón accounts are in agreement, at this point, with the Gallegos and Obregón manuscripts. Notably that it was three days out,[66] a distance of five leagues,[67] and in a pueblo of the Sandía Mountains, that Father Santa María was killed. But Zárate Salmerón, like Mendieta, erroneously places Santa María's death after the departure of the soldiers.

3. *Later Accounts Based upon Mendieta and Zárate Salmerón.*— The Mendieta-Torquemada and the Zárate Salmerón accounts have enjoyed a large following, and largely through them the errors which I have pointed out have persisted for so many years. Vetancurt,[68] Arlégui,[69] Sigüenza,[70] Bancroft,[71] Twitchell,[72] and

[64] Zarate Salmeron, *Land of Sunshine*, XI, 340–341.

[65] *Ibid;* "Zárate Salmerón places Santa María's death some place east of the Sierra de Sandia and three days' journey south of Galisteo, or at San Pablo. Niel changes the name to San Pedro. This is the old San Pedro of today. Three days' journey south of Galisteo would bring one to San Pedro or between San Pedro and Chilili" (Bandelier, *Final Report*, II, 113).

[66] *Ibid.*

[67] Obregon, 193.

[68] Vetancurt, Augustin, *Crónica de la Provincia de Sto. Evangelio de Mexico.*

[69] Arlegui, Joseph, *Crónica de la Provincia de S. Francisco de Zacatecas.*

[70] Siguenza y Gongora, *Mercurio Volante.* (British Museum, Add. MSS. 17363, f. 94.)

[71] Bancroft, *Arizona and New Mexico*, 79.

[72] Twitchell, R. W., *The Leading Facts of New Mexican History.*

Father Engelhardt have accepted the same erroneous version that we find in Torquemada, who has been shown to have copied Mendieta.[73] Bancroft tried to straighten matters out by charging Espejo with confusing facts; he says that the soldier's return was confused with that of the three Indians who came later.[74] Benjamin Read does not commit himself so wholeheartedly to Torquemada, but he misinterprets the declarations of Bustamante and Gallegos, and thus falls into the same errors.[75] Zárate Salmerón's account has been taken almost verbatim by Davis[76] and Prince,[77] and Bandelier accepts as authentic the Davis version.[78] It was Bolton, in recent times, who presented this matter correctly. But as he did not have occasion to do more than record his conclusion, this paper has seemed worth while.

J. Lloyd Mecham,
Seville, Spain.

[73] Icazbalceta establishes the truth of Torquemada's plagiarism in his introduction to Mendieta's *Historia Eclesiastica Indiana*, Mexico, 1870.

[74] Bancroft, *Arizona and New Mexico*, 79, note 7.

[75] Read, Benjamin M., *Illustrated History of New Mexico.*

[76] Davis, W. W. H., *The Spanish Conquest of New Mexico.*

[77] Prince, L. Bradford, *Historical Sketches of New Mexico.*

[78] Bandelier, *Final Report*, II, 228.

MISCELLANY

I

TITULAR SEES OF THE AMERICAN HIERARCHY

(Contributed by Right Rev. Owen B. Corrigan, D.D.)

Although the normal constitution of the hierarchy has always been built on the idea of local jurisdiction of the bishops, yet there are indications, even in the early history of the Church, of many who did not enjoy what is usually called ordinary jurisdiction. Besides those who were endowed with the episcopal character, in order to assist the local bishops, there were those who had been driven from their dioceses by infidels or by heretics, or who for other reasons could not reside in the places to which they had been appointed. The inroads of the Saracens in Asia and Africa were responsible for the vacation of hundreds of sees. During the Crusades, the Latins, who established new Christian communities, composed of people of European nationality and belonging to the Latin Rite, procured the erection of new dioceses for their benefit, and these in turn, when the Turk regained the ascendancy, increased the number of abandoned sees. The final development of the list of sees, called *in partibus infidelium*, took shape, at first, from the attempt of the Holy See to keep up the succession of bishops in these dioceses, in the hope of reconquering their territory from the infidel. When all hope of such redemption was given up, these titles were still conferred on those who were chosen to assist the diocesan bishops in their labors. After the fourteenth century the large increase of population in the great centers rendered such assistance particularly necessary. In the sixteenth century the Holy See inaugurated the policy of endowing with the episcopal character the Nuncios and other Prelates, delegated to represent the Pope in his relations with the different nations, so that they might be on an equality with the diocesan bishops of the countries in which they were ambassadors.

The foundation of the Congregation de Propaganda Fide, in 1622, gave a great impetus to the missionary work of the Church in China and Japan, and elsewhere, a great increase in the number of bishops became necessary and those received their titles from the ancient abandoned sees.

Only about 1850, was any attempt made to compile a list of such sees. Moroni had already, in 1840, begun the publication of his voluminous *Dictionary of Ecclesiastical Erudition*, and to him was confided

the work. He acknowledged the great difficulties that attended this scheme, even after a thorough examination of all the sources at his command.

Since 1851, the *Annuario Pontificio*, published every year at Rome, has such a list, but it does not purport to be full. On the contrary, it contains only those which are in general use. Names of dioceses disappear and are listed again when they are actually occupied. "Hetalonia," for instance, was omitted for a number of years until it was given to the late Bishop Currier at his own request after he resigned Matanzas. He asked for it because it had been the title of the bishop who ordained him.

Until 1882, these titles were given as *in partibus infidelium*. The story goes that the King of Greece complained to Leo XIII that he and his people were injured by this appellation, saying to the Pope, "We are not infidels, we are Christians; we are Catholics." Leo XIII, by a decree of Propaganda, of March 3, 1882, ordered that the formula *in partibus infidelium* should be no longer used and that future appointments should be made as "titular bishops."

The *Annuaire Pontifical Catholique* published by Battandier, Paris, in the issue of 1916, published a very complete list of the titular sees and titular bishops. It is the work of the Rev. Jules Bigaouette, a Canadian priest, and, although it does not claim to be perfect, it displays a wonderful patience and sagacity, containing as it does the names not only of the sees but of the bishops who have held the titles, as far back in some cases as the fourteenth century. Our sketch is simply an abstract of the introduction to their list.

TITULAR SEES ARE CONFERRED

1. On Cardinals, who, being only priests, are promoted in Curia to be bishops. An instance is that Cardinal Pompili, being named, in 1913, Cardinal Vicar, a position that required him to be a bishop, was consecrated titular Archbishop of Philippi, which, as the Annuario tells us, he gave up after his consecration.

2. On Nuncios, Apostolic Delegates and other dignitaries of the Curia, unless they are already diocesan bishops, and under the present custom they, in that case, are translated to titular archbishoprics. Cardinal Falconio, for instance, when appointed Delegate Apostolic, resigned his diocese in Italy and became Archbishop of Larissa.

3. On Coadjutors and Auxiliary Bishops.

4. On Vicars-Apostolic and, sometimes, on Prefects-Apostolic in missionary countries.

5. On Bishops who resign their dioceses, although this is not always

done. Sometimes the Holy See refuses to do so, and sometimes the bishops do not want it.

Our list, which we trust will be found interesting, is confined to those who have been connected with the Hierarchy of the United States, and we have tried to make it reasonably complete.

1. ABDERA (in Thrace),
   Rt. Rev. N. O. Perche,
   Coadjutor of New Orleans, 1870.
2. ACMONIA (in Phrygia),
   Rt. Rev. John B. Morris,
   Coadjutor of Little Rock, 1906.
3. ADRAMYTTIUM (in Proconsular Asia),
   His Eminence, Cardinal Gibbons,
   when V. Ap. of N. Carolina,
   1868.[1]
4. ADRIANOPLE, Abp. (in Thrace),
   Most Rev. Michael Heiss, transferred from La Crosse to be Coadjutor of Milwaukee, 1880.
5. ADRIANOPLE, Bp.
   (1) Rt. Rev. Thomas Kennedy,
   Rector of the American College in Rome, 1907.
   (2) Rt. Rev. Denis M. Lowney,
   Auxiliary of Providence, 1917.
6. AGATHONICA (in Thrace),
   Rt. Rev. John B. Lamy,
   V. Ap. of New Mexico, 1850.
7. ALABANDA (in Caria),
   Rt. Rev. John Brady,
   Auxiliary of Boston, 1891.
8. ALALIS (in Phenicia),
   Rt. Rev. Michael J. Hoban,
   Coadjutor of Scranton, 1896.
9. AMIDA, Abp. (in Mesopotamia),
   (1) The Most Rev. F. N. Blanchet,
   after resignation of Oregon City, 1880.
   (2) The Most Rev. J. B. Pitaval,
   after resignation of Santa Fe, 1918.
10. AMISUS (in the Hellespont),
    Rt. Rev. John E. Fitzmaurice,
    Coadjutor of Erie, 1897.
11. AMMAEDERA (in Proconsular Africa),
    Rt. Rev. Joseph R. Crimont, S. J.,
    V. Ap. of Alaska, 1917.
12. AMYZONIA (in Caria),
    Rt. Rev. Frederick Baraga,
    V. Ap. of Northern Michigan, 1853.
13. ANAZARBA, Abp. (in Cilicia Secunda),
    Most Rev. J. B. Salpointe,
    Coadjutor of Santa Fe, 1884.
14. ANTIGONE (in the Hellespont),
    Rt. Rev. James F. Wood,
    Coadjutor of Philadelphia, 1857.
15. ANTINOE (in Egypt),
    Rt. Rev. Ignatius Mrak,
    after resignation of Marquette, 1891.
16. ANTIPATRIS (in Palestine),
    Rt. Rev. John Stariha,
    after resignation of Lead, 1909.
17. APOLLONIA (in Macedonia),
    (1) Rt. Rev. James Whitfield,
    Coadjutor of Balto., 1828.
    (2) Rt. Rev. Anthony Blanc,
    Coadjutor of New Orleans, 1832. Declined.
    (3) Rt. Rev. Alphonsus J. Glorieux,
    V. Ap. of Idaho, 1885.
18. ARABISSUS (in Armenia),
    Rt. Rev. P. L. Chapelle,
    Coadjutor of Santa Fe, 1891.
19. ARATH (in Cappadocia),
    Rt. Rev. Francis Patrick Kenrick,
    Coadjutor of Philadelphia, 1830.
20. ARCA, Abp. (in Armenia),
    Rt. Rev. Claude M. Dubuis,
    after resignation of Galveston, 1893.
21. AREOPOLIS, Abp. (in Palestine),
    Most Rev. Henry Moeller,
    transferred from Columbus to be Coadjutor of Cincinnati, 1903.
22. ARINDELA (in Palestine),
    Rt. Rev. Joseph H. Conroy,
    Auxiliary of Ogdensburg, 1912.

[1] *Adramyttium* was also the title of the Bp. Rezino who as Auxiliary of Santiago de Cuba was resident at St. Augustine from 1709 to 1711.

23. AULONA or VALONA (in Epirus),
Rt. Rev. Peter Verdaguer,
V. Ap. of Brownsville, 1890.

24. AVARA (in Palestine),
Rt. Rev. Wm. H. Elder, transferred from Natchez to be Coadjutor of Cincinnati, 1880.

25. AUXUM (Abp. In Ethiopia),
Most Rev. Geo. Montgomery, transferred from Los Angeles, to be Coadjutor of San Francisco, 1902.

26. AXIERE (in Mesopotamia),
(1) Rt. Rev. C. Hailandière,
Coadjutor of Vincennes, 1832.
(2) Rt. Rev. John McCloskey,
Coadjutor of New York, 1844.

27. AZOTUS (in Palestine),
Rt. Rev. John J. McCort,
Auxiliary of Philadelphia, 1912,
Coadjutor of Altoona, 1920.

28. BARCA (in Libya),
Rt. Rev. Paul P. Rhode,
Auxiliary of Chicago, 1908.

29. BASILOPOLIS (in Bythinia),
Rt. Rev. John Hughes,
Coadjutor of New York, 1834.

30. BERENICE (in Libya),
Rt. Rev. Thomas F. Hickey,
Coadjutor of Rochester, 1905.

31. BOLINA (in Achaia),
(1) Rt. Rev. Guy Ignatius Chabrat,
Coadjutor of Bardstown, 1834.
(2) Rt. Rev. Ignatius Persico,
after his resignation of Savannah, 1874.

32. CABASA, Abp. (in Egypt),
Most Rev. Patrick Riordan,
Coadjutor of San Francisco, 1883.

33. CALLIPOLIS (in Thrace),
Rt. Rev. John B. Fitzpatrick,
Coadjutor of Boston, 1844.

34. CALYDON (in the Hellespont),
Rt. Rev. Caspar H. Borgess,
Coadjutor and Administrator of Detroit, 1870.

35. CANEA (in Crete),
Rt. Rev. Charles J. Seghers,
transferred from Vancouver, to be Coadjutor of Oregon City, 1878.

36. CANOPUS (in Egypt),
Rt. Rev. Nicholas L. Gallagher,
Coadjutor of Galveston, 1882.

37. CASTABALA (in Cilicia),
(1) Rt. Rev. Louis Lootens,
V. Ap. of Idaho, 1868.
(2) Rt. Rev. John W. Shaw,
Coadjutor of San Antonio, 1910.

38. CERAMUS (in Caria),
Rt. Rev. Patrick Manogue,
Coadjutor of Grass Valley, 1887.

39. CESAREA IN MOROCCO (in Algiers),
Rt. Rev. Thomas F. Brennan,
former Bishop of Dallas, 1905.

40. CESTRO (in Isauria),
Rt. Rev. Edward D. Kelly,
Auxiliary of Detroit, 1910.

41. CIBYRA (in Caria),
(1) Rt. Rev. Richard Phelan,
Coadjutor of Pittsburgh, 1885.
(2) Rt. Rev. Thomas S. Lillis,
transferred from Leavenworth to be Coadjutor of Kansas City, Mo., 1910.

42. CIO, Abp. (in Bythinia),
Most Rev. John J. Keane,
after resignation of Dubuque, 1911.

43. CLAUDIOPOLIS (in Isauria),
(1) Rt. Rev. John B. Odin,
V. Ap. of Texas, 1841.
(2) Rt. Rev. Wm. A. Hickey,
Coadjutor of Providence, 1919.

44. CONSTANTIA, formerly TOMI, Abp. (in Scythia),
(1) Most Rev. John B. Salpointe,
after resignation of Santa Fe, 1894.
(2) Most Rev. Wm. H. O'Connell,
transferred from Portland to be Coadjutor of Boston, 1906

45. CONSTANTINE (in Morocco),
Rt. Rev. Edward Barron,
V. Ap. of Guinea, 1844.

46. CORINTH, Abp. (in Greece),
Most Rev. Bonaventure Cerretti, 1914.

47. CURIUM (in Cyprus),
(1) Rt. Rev. John J. Conroy,
after resignation of Albany, 1878.
(2) Rt. Rev. G. A. Rouxel,
Auxiliary of N. Orleans, 1899.

48. CYZICUS, Abp. (in the Hellespont),
Most Rev. John B. Lamy,
after resignation of Santa Fe,
1885.

49. DAMASCUS, Abp. (in Syria),
Most Rev. John J. Keane,
promoted from Jassus, Rome,
1897.

50. DAMIETTA, Abp. (in Egypt),
Most Rev. Ignatius Persico,
former Bp. of Savannah, 1887.

51. DANABA (in Phenicia),
Rt. Rev. Augustine Verot,
V. Ap. of Florida, Dec., 1857

52. DARNIS, Abp. (in Libya),
Most Rev. Joseph Weber,
promoted from Temnos, 1901.

53. DAULIA (in Achaia),
Rt. Rev. Stephen-Soter Ortynski,
Ordinary in U. S. for the Greco-
Ruthenians, 1907.

54. DELCOS (in Thrace),
Rt. Rev. Peter Dufal,
V. Ap. Eastern Bengal, 1860,
Coadjutor of Galveston, 1878.

55. DIBONA (in Arabia),
Rt. Rev. James O'Connor,
V. Ap. of Nebraska, 1876.

56. DIOCLETIANOPOLIS (in Palestine),
Rt. Rev. James Whelan,
after resignation of Nashville,
1864.

57. DORA (in Palestine),
Rt. Rev. Anthony O'Regan,
after resignation of Chicago,
1858.

58. DORYLAEUM (in Phrygia),
Rt. Rev. John B. Salponte,
V. Ap. of Arizona, 1868.

59. DRASA (in Arabia),
(1) Rt. Rev. Peter Richard Ken-
rick, Coadjutor of Saint Louis,
1841.
(2) Rt. Rev. J. N. Blanchet,
V. Ap. of Oregon, 1844.

60. DULMA (in Bosnia),
Rt. Rev. Dominic Manucey,
V. Ap. of Brownsville, 1874.

61. ECHINUS (in Thessalia),
Rt. Rev. Alfred A. Curtis,
after resignation of Wilmington,
1896.

62. EMESA, Abp. (in Phenicia),
Most Rev. Charles J. Seghers,
Coadjutor of Oregon City, Sept.,
1878.

63. EPHESUS, Abp.,
Most Rev. Sebastian Martinelli,
Apostolic Delegate, 1886.

64. EPIPHANIA (in Cilicia),
Rt. Rev. Joseph Macheboeuf,
V. Ap. of Colorado and Utah,
1868.

65. EUCARPIA (in Phrygia),
(1) Rt. Rev. Edward Barron,
V. Ap. of Guinea, 1844.
(2) Rt. Rev. Louis M. Fink,
O. S. B., V. Ap. of Indian Ter-
ritory, 1871.

66. FLAVIAS (in Cilicia),
(1) Rt. Rev. Joseph Chartrand,
Coadjutor of Indianapolis, 1910.
(2) Rt. Rev. John G. Murray,
Auxiliary of Hartford, 1919.

67. FLAVIOPOLIS,
Rt. Rev. Eugene O'Connell,
V. Ap. of Marysville, 1861.

68. GABALA (in Syria),
Rt. Rev. James Duggan,
Coadjutor of St. Louis, 1887.

69. GERASA (in Palestine),
Rt. Rev. Edmond Heelan,
Auxiliary of Sioux City, 1918.

70. GERMANICOPOLIS (In Isauria),
(1) Rt. Rev. Tobias Mullen,
after his resignation of Erie,
1899.
(2) Rt. Rev. Joseph M. Koudelka,
Auxiliary of Cleveland, 1907,
later Auxiliary of Milwaukee.
(3) Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Shahan,
Rector of the Catholic Univer-
sity of America, 1914.

71. GERMIA (in the Hellespont),
Rt. Rev. Edward Koslowski,
Auxiliary of Milwaukee, 1913.

72. GORTYNA (in Crete),
Rt. Rev. Leonard Neale,
Coadjutor of Baltimore, 1800.

73. Gratianopolis (in Morocco),
Rt. Rev. Ignatius Persico,
Coadjutor to the V. Ap. of Bombay, 1854. V. Ap. of Hindustan and Thibet, 1856.

74. Greater Hermopolis (in Egypt),
Rt. Rev. John J. Lawler,
Auxiliary of St. Paul, 1910.

75. Halia (in Armenia),
Rt. Rev. Rupert Seidenbusch, O. S. B., V. Ap. of Northern Minnesota, 1875.

76. Halicarnassus (in Caria),
Rt. Rev. Thomas F. Doran,
Auxiliary of Providence, 1915.

77. Heliopolis, Abp. (in Phenicia),
Most Rev. Robert Seton, 1903.

78. Hetalonia (in Phenicia),
Rt. Rev. Charles W. Currier,
after resignation of Matanzas, 1915.

79. Hieropolis (in Phrygia),
Rt. Rev. Francis Mora,
Coadjutor of Monterey and Los Angeles, transferred from Mosynopolis, 1896.

80. Hierocesarea (in Lybia),
Rt. Rev. John M. Laval,
Auxiliary of New Orleans, 1911.

81. Ibora (in the Hellespont),
Rt. Rev. Augustine M. Blanchet,
after resignation of Nesqually, 1879.

82. Imeria (in Mesopotamia),
Rt. Rev. John Grimes,
Coadjutor of Syracuse, 1909.

83. Jassus (in Caria),
Rt. Rev. John J. Keane,
First Rector of the Catholic University of America, 1888.

84. Jonoplis (in Caria),
(1) Rt. Rev. James Gibbons,
as Coadjutor of Baltimore, 1877.
(2) Rt. Rev. Francis X. Leray,
Coadjutor of New Orleans, 1879.
(3) Rt. Rev. Joseph Fox,
after resignation of Green Bay, 1914.

85. Joppa (in Palestine),
Rt. Rev. Eugene O'Connell, after resignation of Grass Valley, 1884.

86. Laranda (in Lycaonia),
Rt. Rev. Lawrence Scanlon,
V. Ap. of Utah, 1887.

87. Larissa, Abp. (in Thessaly),
Most Rev. Diomede Falconio,
Apostolic Delegate, 1899.

88. Lebedos (in Asia Minor),
Rt. Rev. Peter J. O'Reilly,
Auxiliary of Peoria, 1900.

89. Lengone (in Galatia),
Rt. Rev. M. J. Spalding,
Coadjutor of Louisville, 1848.

90. Lepanto, Abp. (in Epirus),
Most Rev. Francis Satolli,
Apostolic Delegate, 1888.

91. Limyra (in Lycia),
Rt. Rev. Augustus Ravoux,
V. Ap. of Montana, 1868, declined.

92. Loryma (in Caria),
Rt. Rev. George Mundelein,
Auxiliary of Brooklyn, 1909.

93. Lycopolis (in Egypt),
Rt. Rev. James Trobec,
after resignation of St. Cloud, 1914.

94. [1] Lyrba (in Pamphylia),
(1) Rt. Rev. John Prendergast,
Coadjutor of Grass Valley, 1875, declined.
(2) Rt. Rev. Mark S. Gross,
V. Ap. of N. Carolina, 1880, declined.

95. Macra (in Morocco),
Rt. Rev. Owen B. Corrigan,
Auxiliary of Baltimore, 1908.

96. Marcianopolis, Abp. (in Mesia),
Most Rev. Peter Richard Kenrick,
after resignation of St. Louis, 1895.

97. Marcopolis (in Mesopotamia),
(1) Rt. Rev. James Whelan,
Coadjutor of Nashville, 1859.
(2) Rt. Rev. A. J. McGavick,
Auxiliary of Chicago, 1899.

[1] The Rt. Rev. Thomas Molloy was appointed on June 28, 1920, Bishop of Lorea and Auxiliary of Brooklyn.

98. MARONIA,
(1) Rt. Rev. John Ireland, Coadjutor of St. Paul, 1875.
(2) Rt. Rev. Dominic Manucy, after resignation of Mobile and appointment for second time as V. Ap. of Brownsville, 1885.

99. MAURICASTRO (in Mesopotamia),
Rt. Rev. John B. David, Coadjutor of Bardstown, 1817.

100. MELITENE, Abp. (in Armenia),
Most Rev. John Bonzano, Apostolic Delegate, 1912.

101. MENNITH (in Palestine),
(1) Rt. Rev. John M. Odin was named to this see in 1841, but declined.
(2) Rt. Rev Thomas Grace, O.P., after resignation of St. Paul, 1884.

102. MESSENE (in Greece),
(1) Rt. Rev. John B. Miege, S. J., V. Ap. of Indian Territory, 1850.
(2) Rt. Rev. Leo Haid, O. S. B., V. Ap. of N. Carolina, 1888.

103. METELLOPOLIS (in Phrygia),
Rt. Rev. James Carroll, after resignation of Nueva Segovia, 1912.

104. MILOPOTAMUS (in Crete),
Rt. Rev. James Davis, Coadjutor of Davenport, 1904.

105. MOCESSUS, abp. (in Cappadocia),
Most Rev. Otto Zardetti, after resignation of Bucharest, 1895.

106. MODRA (in Bithynia),
Rt. Rev. John Michaud, Coadjutor of Burlington, 1892.

107. MOSYNOPOLIS (in Thrace),
Rt. Rev. Francis Mora, Coadjutor of Los Angeles, 1873.

108. MYRINA (in Proconsular Asia),
Rt. Rev. Joseph G. Anderson, Auxiliary of Boston, 1912.

109. NILOPOLIS,
Rt. Rev. John M. Gannon, Auxiliary of Erie, 1918.

110. OLENO (in Achaia),
Rt. Rev. Michael Portier, V. Ap. of Alabama and Florida, 1825.

111. ORIA (in Proconsular Africa),
Rt. Rev. Wm. Clancy, Coadjutor of Charleston, 1834, V. Ap. of British Guiana, 1837.

112. OXYRINCHIA, Abp. (in Egypt),
Most Rev. John J. Kain, transferred from Wheeling to be Coadjutor of St. Louis, 1893.

113. PELUSIUM, Abp. (in Egypt),
Most Rev. Joseph Alemanny, O. P., after resignation of San Francisco, 1885.

114. PERGAMUS (in Proconsular Asia),
Rt. Rev. Thomas Foley, Coadjutor and Administrator of Chicago, 1870.

115. PETRA, Abp. (in Palestine),
Most Rev. M. A. Corrigan, transferred from Newark to be Coadjutor of New York, 1880.

116. PHACUSA (in Egypt),
Rt. Rev. Caspar Borgess, after resignation of Detroit, 1888.

117. PHILADELPHIA (in Lydia),
Rt. Rev. F. N. Blanchet, V. Ap. of Oregon, 1843.
On account of confusion with Philadelphia in America he was in 1844, transferred to Drasa.

118. PHILIPPOPOLIS, Abp. (in Thrace),
Most Rev. Bonaventure Cerretti, Ap. Delegate to Australia, April, 1914.

119. PINARA (in Lycia),
Rt. Rev. John J. Glennon, Coadjutor of Kansas City, 1896. Coadjutor of St. Louis, 1903.

120. POMARIO (in Morocco),
Rt. Rev. Denis O'Donaghue, Auxiliary of Indianapolis, 1900.

121. POMPEIOPOLIS (in Cilicia),
(1) Rt. Rev. Bernard O'Reilly, Coadjutor of Hartford, 1850.
(2) Rt. Rev. Sylvester H. Rosecrans, Auxiliary of Cincinnati, 1861.

122. Raphanea (in Syria),
Rt. Rev. James O'Gorman,
V. Ap. of Nebraska, 1859.

123. Rhesina (in Mesopotamia),
Rt. Rev. Francis McNierney,
Coadjutor and Administrator of Albany, 1871.

124. Rosalia (in Pisidia),
Rt. Rev. Henry P. Northrop,
V. Ap. of N. Carolina, 1881.

125. Sabrata (in Tripoli),
Rt. Rev. J. F. Regis Canavan,
Coadjutor of Pittsburgh, 1902.

126. Salamis, Abp. (in Cyprus),
Rt. Rev. P. J. Ryan,
Coadjutor of St. Louis, 1884.

127. Samos (in the Archipelago),
Rt. Rev. Thos. J. Conaty,
Rector of the Catholic University of America, 1901.

128. Samosata (in Syria),
Rt. Rev. Lawrence Graessel,
Coadjutor of Baltimore, 1793. (The first appointment of this kind in U. S. He died before his consecration.)

129. Scillio (in Proconsular Africa),
Rt. Rev. Edmond Prendergast,
Auxiliary of Philadelphia, 1896.

130. Scythopolis, Abp. (in Palestine),
Most Rev. J. L. Spalding,
after resignation of Peoria, 1908.

131. Sebaste, Abp. (in Armenia),
Most Rev. P. L. Chapelle,
Coadjutor of Santa Fe, 1893.

132. Sebaste, Bp. (in Laodicea),
Rt. Rev. Denis O'Connell,
Rector of the Catholic University of America, 1907. Auxiliary of San Francisco, 1908.

133. Seleucia, Abp. (in Isauria),
Most Rev. Thomas Kennedy,
Rector of the American College, Rome, 1915.

134. Sidyma (in Lycia),
Rt. Rev. Theophilus Meerschaert,
V. Ap. of Indian Territory,
1891.

135. Siunia, Abp. (in Armenia),
Most Rev. Thomas Grace, O.P.,
after his resignation of St. Paul, transferred from Mennith, 1889.

136. Sophene (in Armenia),
Rt. Rev. Joseph Schrembs,
Auxiliary of Grand Rapids, 1911.

137. Sora (in Paphlagonia),
Rt. Rev. J. B. Pitaval,
Auxiliary of Santa Fe, 1902.

138. Stauropolis, Abp. (in Caria),
Most Rev. Ambrose Marechal,
Coadjutor of Baltimore, 1817.

139. Tagaste (in Numidia),
Rt. Rev. Patrick J. Hayes,
Auxiliary of New York, 1914.

140. Tamassus (in Cyprus),
Rt. Rev. Peter Muldoon,
Auxiliary of Chicago, 1901.

141. Telmessus (in Lycia),
Rt. Rev. Nicholas Matz,
Coadjutor of Denver, 1887.

142. Temnos (in Proconsular Asia),
Rt. Rev. Joseph Weber,
Auxiliary of Lemberg, Austria, 1895. Afterwards, Provincial of the Fathers of the Resurrection, Chicago.

143. Tenagra (in Boetia),
Rt. Rev. Joseph Rosati, C.M.,
Coadjutor of New Orleans, 1822.

144. Thaumacum (in Thessalia),
Rt. Rev. Peter Bourgade,
V. Ap. of Arizona, 1885.

145. Themiscyra (in the Hellespont),
Rt. Rev. Thomas Cusack,
Auxiliary of New York, 1904.

146. Thanasis (in Egypt),
Rt. Rev. Clement Smyth, Trappist, Coadjutor of Dubuque, 1857.

147. Thermas (in Cappadocia),
Rt. Rev. Samuel Eccleston,
Coadjutor of Baltimore, 1834.

148. THMUIS (in Egypt),
Rt. Rev. George Montgomery,
Coadjutor of Los Angeles, 1894.

149. TIBERIAS (in Palestine),
Rt. Rev. Martin Marty,
V. Ap. of Dakota, 1879.

150. TIPASA (in Morocco),
Rt. Rev. Michael J. Gallagher,
Coadjutor of Grand Rapids, 1915.

151. TITOPOLIS (in Isauria),
Rt. Rev. Edward J. Hanna,
Auxiliary of San Francisco, 1912.

152. TRICOMIA (in Palestine),
Rt. Rev. P. J. Ryan,
Coadjutor of St. Louis, 1872.

153. TRIPOLIS (in Africa),
Rt. Rev. John J. Williams,
Coadjutor of Boston, 1865.

154. UTILLA,
Rt. Rev. Thomas Brennan,[3]
after resignation of Dallas, 1893.

155. VERA (in Proconsular Africa),
Rt. Rev. John B. Timon, is listed in Battandier (1916) as Coadjutor of St. Louis, from May 16, 1839 to 1842. He never served as such.

156. ZELA (in the Hellespont),
Rt. Rev. Peter Lefevere,
Coadjutor and Administrator of Detroit, 1841.

157. ZEUGMA (in Syria),
Rt. Rev. John M. Farley,
Auxiliary of New York, 1895.

II

The Kensington Rune Stone

(*Contributed by the Very Rev. Francis J. Schaefer, D. D., Rector, The St. Paul Seminary, St. Paul, Minn.*)

The editor of THE CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW has asked the writer to present to its readers a brief summary of the Kensington Rune Stone, the discovery of which aroused considerable interest and controversy some years ago. The following paper, with modifications and additions, is based upon one written for the *Acta et Dicta*, the annual publication of the Catholic Historical Society of St. Paul, where it appeared in the July number of 1910.

It was in November, 1898, that a Swedish farmer, by the name of Olaf Ohman, was busying himself in clearing a tract of his land, situated about three miles in a northerly direction from Kensington, Douglas County, Minn. While uprooting a poplar tree, about eight or ten inches in diameter, on the side of a morainic hill, he discovered a stone, which has since been the subject of considerable comment and study.

The stone is about 30 inches long, 16 inches wide, and 6 inches thick, and weighs about 230 pounds. It is a graywacke, of dark gray color,

[3] The above was taken from REUSS, *Biog. Cyclop.* The title is not listed either by the *Annuario* or by Battandier. There is a *Usilla*, but that was held by a retired French bishop from 1901 to 1914 The name of Bishop Brennan was carried on the *Annuario* in the special list of Bishops who have no title from 1893 to 1905, when he received the title of *Cesarea* in Morocco.

evidently rifted from some large boulder of the glacial drift, which forms the surface of all the region. On the face of the stone and on the side there is an inscription in strange characters, which were believed, and have since been proven to be, runic letters, such as were in use centuries ago among the Germanic and Scandinavian nations; the inscription on the face contains nine lines, and that on the side three.

There was no runic scholar in the neighborhood of Kensington, and the stone was sent to a professor of Scandinavian literature in the University of Minnesota, and to other Swedish, Norwegian, and Danish scholars in Chicago. They deciphered the inscription; but as it contained the account of an exploration to that spot by Norsemen in the fourteenth century, it was generally considered as a fraud of recent date. And thus the stone was returned to its owner, who used it as a step to the door of his barn.

A new examination of the inscription was made afterwards by Mr. Hjalmar Rued Holand, a graduate of the University of Wisconsin, and an efficient scholar of Scandinavian history and literature. While preparing a history of Norwegian immigration to the United States, he traveled extensively among the Norwegian settlements of the Northwest. In August, 1907, he happened to be in Douglas County; there he learned from Mr. Ohman the circumstances of the finding of the stone and obtained it from him for further study. The result of his researches was presented in an elaborate paper, read at a meeting of the Minnesota Historical Society, December 13, 1909.

The inscription, as interpreted in English by Mr. Holand, reads as follows:

8 *Goths* [*Swedes*] *and* 22 *Norwegians on* [*an*] *exploring journey from Vinland very far west. We had a camp by* 2 *skerries* [*rocks in the water*] *one day's journey north from this stone. We were* [*out*] *fishing one day. When we returned home* [*we*] *found* 10 *men red with blood and dead. A V M* [Ave Maria, *or* Ave Virgo Maria]. *Save* [*us*] *from evil.*

[*We*] *have* 10 *men by the sea to look after our vessel.* 14 [41?] *days' journey from this island. Year* 1362.

We gather from this inscription that thirty Swedish and Norwegian explorers came to the central western part of what is now Minnesota on a journey of exploration made in 1362. Their starting point was Vinland, a country along the eastern coast of North America. They put up a camp near a lake, at the point of which were found two rocks in the water; the camping place was about a day's journey to the north from the spot where the stone was found. One day they went out fishing on the lake; and when they returned to their camp, they found that 10 of their men had been killed by savages. Thereupon they packed up their belongings and departed in all haste, at first in a southerly direc-

tion. After having traveled for about a day, they rested on an island, carved into a stone the record of their journey, and addressed a prayer to the Blessed Virgin Mary to save them from further evil. Their ship was left by the sea in the custody of 10 men, at a distance of about 41 days' journey. (The rendering of the numerals indicating the distance to their ship is not altogether certain; they might mean 14 or 41 days. However, 41 seems to be more probable.)

The great question in connection with the Kensington Rune Stone is whether the inscription be genuine, *i. e.*, whether it be really a record left there by Scandinavian explorers in the fourteenth century. It may be said at the very outset, that direct evidences or testimonies in favor of its authenticity are lacking; and, to judge from the nature of the case, they probably will never be found. All that can be done is to gather a certain number of reasons or facts which will make it likely that the monument is really what it claims to be.

The idea of a recent fraud seems to be excluded by the circumstances of the place. The stone was lying flat with its rune-inscribed face downward, was thinly covered by the surface soil; and over it had grown a poplar tree, which had sent its main roots down at one side of the stone, while another large root crossed the stone and then passed down at its opposite edge. All the roots that covered the stone were flattened on the side nearest to it; and the tree, according to a general estimate, was about forty years old. Hence the stone was in its position at least since about the year 1860; a time when there were no white settlers within 100 miles of the place, and the nearest railroad was 400 miles away.

The journey itself of these daring Norsemen into the interior of the American continent is not at all impossible. It is a matter of history that the Norsemen visited the coast of North America, a section of which they called Vinland (land of wine—either New England or Nova Scotia), from the abundance of wild grapes found there. These visits commenced about the year 1000, and continued for several centuries. Whether any permanent colonies were founded or not, is still a matter of dispute among scholars; but at any rate it is almost certain that the expeditions were equipped with a large number of men. Why should not some of them, during a longer sojourn in Vinland, undertake a journey of exploration into the interior of the land, which offered to them such large treasures in natural resources?

The important matter to be examined is the language and the style of the inscription. Mr. Holand and others are satisfied that both are in perfect harmony with the Scandinavian documents of the fourteenth century, with which the inscription of the rune stone was compared.

One particular feature seems to bear out their contention; the salutation addressed to the Blessed Virgin Mary, the *Ave Maria*, which shows the faith of the people in the Middle Ages, the habit of having recourse to the Mother of God in all circumstances, particularly in times of need and distress. The Norsemen of the fourteenth century were one in faith with the Catholics of other countries of Europe; and hence they had the same customs and devotions. It was only after the rise of the Protestant Reformation, that they were led away from the unity of the Catholic Church. If a Scandinavian of our own time had perpetrated forgery, he would scarcely have thought of placing the invocation to the Virgin Mary on the stone, because anything like a devotion to the Saints is rather foreign to the mind of Protestants.

Concerning the probable route taken by the explorers, Prof. Andrew Fossum, of St. Olaf College, Northfield, Minn., has given an interesting theory in the *Norwegian American*, Northfield, Minn., October 22, 1909. According to his view, the travelers set out from Vinland, passed through Hudson straits into Hudson Bay, left their ship near the mouth of Nelson or Hayes River, made a canoe journey into Lake Winnipeg, along the Red River to its first series of strong rapids and falls, terminating a few miles below Fergus Falls, and thence crossing the country probably by streams, small lakes, and portages, some twenty miles southeastward to Pelican Lake. For this inland journey fourteen days might be sufficient, provided the travelers were on the road for about fifteen hours a day, and were not hampered by special difficulties. Still it is rather a short space of time for such a long distance; and hence the rendering of the numerals in the inscription by 41 days is altogether more likely.

The opinion of Mr. Hjalmar Rued Holand as to the genuineness of the runic inscription on the Kensington Stone was shared by the Museum Committee of the Minnesota Historical Society, which, through one of its members, submitted the entire question in all its aspects to a searching investigation. Several other Scandinavian scholars and writers arrayed themselves on this side. However, it must be admitted, that other students of Norse history and literature both in America and Europe stoutly maintained that the document was a fraud of a modern runologist. Among these must be mentioned in particular Prof. George T. Flom, who in an address delivered before the Illinois State Historical Society at Springfield, Ill., May 5, 1910, endeavored to prove, that the runes of the inscription are of a late origin, and its language entirely modern.

The Rune Stone is in the possession of Mr. Holand, who placed it on exhibition in Chicago, Ill., Madison, Wis., Northfield, Minn.,

and St. Paul, Minn. During the spring and summer of the year 1911, he took it with him for further examination to Rouen, France, and to several places in Sweden and Norway. Interesting accounts of all the questions connected with it are found in *Harper's Weekly*, October 9, 1909, from the pen of Mr. Holand, and in *Records of the Past*, January-February, 1910, by Mr. Warren Upham, then Secretary of the Minnesota Historical Society. A preliminary report of the Museum Committee of the Minnesota Historical Society was presented to the same society at the meeting of its Executive Council, May 9, 1910, published in December of the same year 1910, and finally incorporated into Volume XV of the Society's *Collections*, issued in May, 1915. A list of essays on the same subject by various writers is published in the Bibliographic Section of this issue.

III

LES "ACTA SANCTORUM" DES BOLLANDISTES

(Contributed by the Rev. Robert Lechat, S. J., Brussels, Belgium)

L'actif et dévoué secrétaire de la *Catholic Historical Review* m'a demandé de faire connaître aux lecteurs de cet érudit périodique l'oeuvre des Bollandistes. Une invitation si aimable et si flatteuse ne pouvait guère être déclinée. Les marques d'intérêt si précieuses que nous donnent en ce moment plusieurs sommités scientifiques des Etats-Unis ne nous obligent-elles pas à déférer avec empressement à leurs moindres désirs? et ne nous sont-elles pas un gage de la curiosité sympathique avec laquelle le public américain lira ces quelques pages?

La Société des Bollandistes est l'une des plus anciennes, sinon la plus ancienne société savante et littéraire de l'ancien monde. Fondée au xvii^e^ siècle par des Jésuites Belges, elle a continué, avec une interruption de 42 années pendant la suppression de la Compagnie de Jésus, à rester le monopole exclusif des Pères de la province Belge. Elle eut son siège à Anvers en la maison professe jusqu'à la fin du xviii^e^ siècle; depuis le rétablissement au xix^e^ siècle, elle est fixée à Bruxelles, au collège Saint-Michel. Le nombre de ses membres a toujours été très limité. Deux au début, ils ont ordinairement été 4 ou 5 et n'ont jamais dépassé le chiffre de 6.

Le premier qui conçut l'idée de l'oeuvre fut le P. Héribert Rosweyde, en 1603. En lisant les Vies des Saints, il avait été peiné d'y rencontrer tant d'histoires apocryphes et parfois même d'une orthodoxie douteuse et il pensa que les bibliothèques de Belgique, si riches en manuscrits hagiographiques, fourniraient aisément des textes plus authen-

tiques et plus satifaisants, dont la publication remplacerait avantageusement les anciennes compilations à la plus grande gloire de l'Eglise et de ses saints. Et avec l'approbation de ses supérieurs, il se mit résolument à la besogne. En 1607, il publia sous le titre *Fasti sanctorum quorum vitae in belgicis bibliothecis manuscriptae*, le plan de la future collection. Le projet comportait 1300 Vies de saints contenues dans les manuscrits des bibliothèques de Belgique. De la plupart Rosweyde s'était déjà procuré la copie. Malheureusement d'autres occupations, le ministère des confessions, diverses publications scientifiques, venaient continuellement le distraire et enrayer son oeuvre principale. Aussi mourut-il en 1629 sans avoir rien publié de la collection projetée. Il laissait pourtant une oeuvre apparentée aux *Acta Sanctorum*, le *Vitae Patrum*, paru en 1616, réédition scientifique des Vies des Pères du désert.

Apres la mort de Rosweyde, les supérieurs chargèrent le P. Jean Bollandus d'examiner la masse considérable de papiers laissés par l'hagiographe et d'aviser à l'usage qu'on pourrait en faire. Jean Bollandus, qui donna son nom à l'oeuvre, était alors âgé de 36 ans. Il était né à Julémont, près de Liége, où, jusqu'en ces derniers temps, on montrait sa maison. Elle a été détruite en août 1914 lors de l'incendie du village par les Allemands. Bollandus reprit, en l'élargissant, le plan de Rosweyde. Il ouvrit les portes de la collection non seulement aux Saints dont on retrouverait des Actes, mais à ceux aussi qui n'avaient pas encore rencontré de biographe. A défaut d'Actes, on leur constituerait une notice formée de tous les renseignements puisés aux sources. Après quelques années de travail, Bollandus se rendit compte qu'un seul homme ne suffirait jamais à la tâche. On lui donna pour collaborateur le P. Godefroid Henschenius, son ancien élève; plus tard (1659) on leur adjoignit le P. Daniel Papebroch, qui fut peut-être le plus illustre de tous les Bollandistes. L'entretien des collaborateurs, la copie des manuscrits, l'achat des livres, les voyages qu'il fallut bientôt entreprendre à la recherche des manuscrits supposaient des dépenses que ne pouvait supporter la maison professe d'Anvers dépourvue de revenus. La générosité de l'abbé de Liessies constitua par un don de 800 florins le premier fonds du patrimoine de la société.

Les deux premiers volumes des *Acta Sanctorum*, contenant les saints du mois de janvier, parut en 1643. Ce fut un succès. Tout le monde savant applaudit à l'heureuse initiative des deux Jésuites Belges et à la méthode scientifique qu'ils avaient appliquée aux textes hagiographiques. Rosweyde était mort depuis 14 ans quand l'oeuvre qu'il avait rêvée commença à voir le jour. Il avait cru l'enclore toute entière en 12 volumes et comptait bien mener lui-même l'entreprise à bonne fin. Voici trois siècles qu'un labeur à peu près ininterrompu poursuit la

tâche commencée; la collection atteint actuellement 64 volumes plus les *auctaria*, et l'on n'en entrevoit pas encore la fin: le dernier volume paru (1910) contient les saints des 6, 7 et 8 novembre. C'est qu'à mesure qu'on avance la masse des matérieux recueillis s'enfle démesurément. Janvier n'avait que 2 volumes; février en a déjà trois; mai en aura 7 et octobre ira jusqu'à 13! La recherche des documents nécessitait de longs voyages à travers toute l'Europe. Les exigences de la critique se sont faites aussi de plus en plus difficiles et les Bollandistes avaient le souci de perfectionner sans cesse leur méthode et de se tenir à la hauteur des progrès de la science. La mort prématurée de tel ou tel collaborateur, la difficulté de trouver des recrues aptes à un travail si spécial vinrent encore à certains moments retarder la marche de l'oeuvre. C'étaient là de ces mécomptes auxquels n'échappe aucune entreprise de longue haleine. La catastrophe allait arriver à la fin du xviii^{e} siècle.

En 1773, la Compagnie de Jésus était supprimée. Ce coup qui atteignait les hagiographes dans leurs affections les plus chères, ne tua pas net leur oeuvre. Fortement ébranlée, la Société des Bollandistes prolongea encore de quelques années une existence précaire. Sécularisés, dépouillés de leurs biens comme les autres Jésuites, les Bollandistes furent pourtant autorisés à continuer en commun leurs études. Une pension leur fut assurée par le Gouvernement. Admis temporairement à demeurer dans la maison professe d'Anvers, ils durent bientôt chercher refuge ailleurs. L'abbaye de Coudenberg à Bruxelles les recueillit d'abord (1778). En 1780, l'abbaye ayant été supprimée par Joseph II, ils habitèrent quelque temps l'ancien collège des Jésuites de Bruxelles, puis trouvèrent asile en l'abbaye des Prémontrés de Tongerloo. Enfin l'heure de la dissolution définitive sonna quand les troupes républicaines françaises envahirent la Belgique et confisquèrent les biens ecclésiastiques.

Ce qu'il y a d'étonnant, c'est que pendant cette période de trouble, de continuels déménagements, d'insécurité et d'angoisse, les Bollandistes réussirent à publier trois volumes des *Acta Sanctorum:* à Bruxelles, en 1780 le tome IV d'octobre, en 1786 le tome V, à Tongerloo, en 1794 le tome VI. Pour ces trois volumes ils furent aidés par la collaboration de quelques religieux de Coudenberg et de Tongerloo.

Pas plus que la Compagnie de Jésus, la Société des Bollandistes n'était morte sans retour. Elle ressuscita peu d'années après le rétablissemant de la Compagnie en Belgique. En 1834, trois Jésuites furent chargés de continuer l'oeuvre laissée inachevée par les anciens Bollandistes. Ils s'installèrent au collège Saint-Michel à Bruxelles. Mais quelle tâche bien capable de décourager les plus intrépides! Tout était à refaire. Les traditions étaient rompues; l'expérience lentement accumulée par les prédécesseurs était perdue; de l'ancienne génération

plus un seul survivant; les notes, les instruments de travail disparus; la belle bibliothèque avait été en partie confisquée par le gouvernement autrichien, en partie vendue, en partie aussi rachetée plus tard par le gouvernement hollandais qui en envoya les imprimés à La Haye et les manuscrits à la bibliothèque Royale de Bruxelles. Pour aider la société à renaître, le gouvernement belge lui accorda un subside annuel de 6000 francs, qui fut retiré en 1869 à l'instigation de députés anti-cléricaux. Les Bollandistes en sont donc réduits pour vivre au produit de la vente de leurs ouvrages et au revenu d'un modeste patrimoine formé peu à peu à force d'économie et à l'aide de dons. La bibliothèque a dû se reconstituer aussi de toutes pièces. Le gouvernement français et le gouvernement anglais y contribuèrent en envoyant gracieusement leurs grandes publications. Actuellement la bibliothèque se développe surtout grâce aux ouvrages envoyés pour être recensés dans les *Analecta Bollandiana*, et par voie d'échange. Elle contient à présent près de 150,000 volumes. Avant la guerre, elle recevait, soit par abonnement soit par échange, environ 600 revues de tous les pays du monde. Dans ce nombre l'Amérique était représentée par une quarantaine de périodiques. Depuis 1905, la bibliothèque est installée dans de nouveaux locaux spacieux et confortables. Une salle de consultation a été aménagée en faveur des savants étrangers.

Nous n'avons fait que retracer dans ses grandes lignes l'histoire des Bollandistes. Pour plus de détails, nous nous permettons de renvoyer le lecteur au livre intitulé *A travers trois siècles. L'oeuvre des Bollandistes, 1615–1915* (Bruxelles, 1920, in-8°, 282 pp.), que le P. Delehaye vient de dédier à l'éminent directeur de l'*American Historical Review*, M. J. Franklin Jameson.

Une traduction anglaise de cet opuscule est prête et n'attend pour paraître qu'une solution de la crise du papier.

Mais il est temps que nous passions de l'histoire des hommes à l'examen de leur oeuvre.[1] Ouvrons donc les grands in-folios des *Acta Sanctorum* et tâchons de nous rendre compte de ce qu'ils contiennent.

Le but de l'ouvrage est de "rassembler et de discuter les monuments de l'histoire et du culte des saints." Par saints, il faut entendre non seulement les saints canonisés, mais tous les personnages dont la mémoire a été, dans quelque église officiellement honorée. Aucune limite chronologique ni géographique. *Sancti quotquot toto orbe coluntur*, porte le frontispice de la collection. Dans cette universalité l'Amérique, quoique tard venue dans la grande famille chrétienne, a sa part elle aussi, car nombreux sont les apôtres qui dès la découverte du Nouveau Monde et dans la suite y versèrent leur sang pour le Christ; nombreuses les vierges qui fleurirent sur cette terre nouvelle. Les *Acta Sanctorum*

[1] See p. 385 of this issue for a list of their works.

présentent donc pour l'histoire des Etats-Unis et en général pour celle de l'Amérique tant du Sud que du Nord, une mine de matériaux qui n'est pas à dédaigner. Il suffira par exemple de citer les Actes de Ste Rose de Lima qui n'occupent pas moins de 37 pages infolio, ceux de S. François Solano qui en remplissent 63; le B. Philippe de Jésus mexicain, est traité parmi les xxvi martyrs du Japon, au 5 février. Le B. Martin de Porras a sa place au 5 novembre, dans le dernier volume paru.

La tâche de l'hagiographe embrasse à la fois l'histoire du saint lui-même et l'histoire de son culte. L'histoire du saint est livrée par les Actes ou les *Vitae*; l'histoire du culte par les *Miracula*, recueil des grâces obtenues par l'intercession du saint, qui fait souvent suite aux Actes. Les anciens Bollandistes assez séveres dans leur choix éliminaient volontiers les Actes de caractère évidemment imaginaires, apocryphes, superstitieux. Les Bollandistes modernes ont cru devoir donner droit de cité même à ces compositions suspectes, car si elles n'apprennent rien sur le saint lui-même, elles sont révélatrices de la mentalité et des moeurs d'un peuple, d'une époque et, quoique de nulle valeur pour l'édification des fidèles, elles peuvent rendre à la science de précieux services. Car il est à remarquer que ce n'est pas seulement à l'hagiographe que les Actes des saints fournissent des matériaux; ils sont autant des documents d'histoire profane, d'archéologie, de folk-lore, d'histoire économique, de géographie locale.

La publication du texte des Actes et des Miracles constitue la partie principale, essentielle, de chaque notice. Le but de l'oeuvre étant avant tout de fournir le texte primitif, original des sources de l'histoire des saints. Le texte des Actes est évidemment établi d'après les meilleurs manuscrits et muni, du moins dans les derniers volumes, d'un apparat critique. L'annotation constitue une seconde partie de la notice. Dans ces notes d'intérêt biographique, généalogique, géographique, linguistique, nos anciens Bollandistes ont accumulé des trésors d'érudition. Enfin comme introduction à la publication du texte il y a un *Commentarius praevius* où l'hagiographe rend compte de ses sources, les critque, en tire les conclusions. Il y expose aussi et y rassemble les preuves du culte dont le saint a joui: élévation ou translation des reliques, églises construites en son honneur, indulgences, fêtes, et, s'il y a lieu, procès de canonisation.

A titre d'exemple, voyons comment ce programme est réalisé relativement à Ste Rose de Lima, une des plus pures gloires de l'Eglise d'Amérique. La notice de la sainte est donnée au 26 août (*Acta Sanct.* Aug. t. V, pp. 892–1029). Le *commentarius praevius* (p. 892–902) est dû à la plume du Bollandiste Guillaume Cuperus. Il est divisé en 4 paragraphes. Dans le parag. 1, l'hagiographe raconte comment, dès le

lendemain de la mort de la sainte (1617), la nouvelle en parvint en Europe. Il reproduit les éloges que dans lettres au Souverain Pontife des religieux de divers ordres décernaient à la religieuse défunte. Le parag. 2 traite du procès de béatification qui fut ouvert dès 1663, et reproduit divers documents de la Sacrée Congrégation des Rites relatifs à ce procès. Les progrès du culte de la sainte sont notés dans le parag. 3: décret de Clément IX déclarant Ste Rose patronne principale du royaume de Pérou (1669), inscription de son nom au martyrologe romain, extension à divers pays de l'Europe du privilège de rèciter son office et de célébrer sa messe; enfin (1 avril 1671) décret solennel de canonisation. Dans le parag. 4, le P. Cuperus passe en revue, en donnant une brève notice sur chacun d'eux, les divers auteurs qui écrivirent la Vie de sainte Rose. Il s'attarde surtout à l'aeuvre du P. Léonard Hansen, Dominicain, qui est celle qu'il va reproduire. A la p. 902, commence le texte de cette Vie. Comme il ne s'agit pas ici d'un pièce inédite mais de la simple reproduction d'un livre imprimé, le travail de critique du texte est à peu près nul. Les annotations dont Cuperus fait suivre chaque chapitre, fournissent surtout des explications philologiques, des précisions géographiques qui devaient fort intéresser les lecteurs de l'ancien monde, de curieuses notions de médecine aussi sur les maladies: cancer, angine, asthme, pleurésie, ou sur les remèdes pilules, phlebotomie, cataplasmes, emplâtres, des descriptions de fruits ou de plantes du Pérou: cacao, grenade, tabac, etc. Après la Vita, la *Gloria posthuma*, dont Léonard Hansen fait encore les frais. Il y est question des triomphales funérailles faites à l'humble religieuse, de l'élévation de ses reliques, des apparitions de la sainte, de ses miracles. La notice se termine par le texte intégral de la bulle de canonisation.

Tous les saints ne sont pas traités avec cette ampleur. Il en est en effet dont les Actes n'existent plus ou n'ont peut-être jamais existé. Pour ceux-là on se contente, comme nous l'avons dit, de réunir et de grouper tous les renseignements épars dans les sources. Pour d'autres on n'a même pas cette ressource, tant les documents sont discrets à leur sujet; pour d'autres enfin on doute s'ils ont jamais été honoré d'un culte véritable et si ce culte est légitime. On ne pouvait pourtant pas les passer absolument sous silence. Voilà pourquoi on les a groupés en tête de chaque jour en leur accordant à chacun quelques lignes souvent fécondes en renseignements utiles. Ce sont les *Praetermissi*. Ainsi le B. Ignace d'Azévédo et ses campagnons martyrs sont mentionnés au 15 juillet. On y explique en deux mots qu'ils ont été capturés sur mer près de l'île de Palma par le pirate hérétique Soria, mis à mort de diverses manières et jetés à la mer . On renvoie au récit en quatre livres édité à Rome en 1679 par le P. Possinus. Car le procés de béati-

fication est pendant en cour de Rome; on en attendra l'issue pour commémorer plus au long leur triomphe. Par la même raison, S. Pierre Claver qui n'était encore ni canonisé ni béatifié quand parut le tome III de septembre (1750), ne reçut qu'une simple mention au 8 de ce mois En même temps que les Praetermissi, sont signalés aussi les saints qui ayant plusieurs fêtes dans l'année sont traités au long à une autre date: *in alios dies relati.* La notice de sainte Rose de Lima est donnée au 26 août, date sous laquelle cette sainte figure au martyrologe romain. Mais comme on récite son office le 30 août, une brève mention de la même sainte se rencontre parmi les Praetermissi de ce jour.

Nous touchons ici à un point qui a été souvent critiqué et qui ne laisse pas que d'incommoder gravement les éditeurs des *Acta* eux-mêmes, à savoir l'ordre adopté dans la collection, qui est l'ordre du calendrier. N'aurait-il pas été mille fois plus avantageux dé suivre l'ordre chronologique, de traiter d'abord tous les saints d'un siècle, puis ceux du siècle suivant; ou bien l'ordre géographique, procédant par pays. Cela aurait permis aux éditeurs, en se spécialisant, de posséder plus à fonds leur matière au lieu qu'aujourd'hui, pour composer un seul volume ils doivent se rendre maîtres de mátériaux échelonnés sur 20 siècles d'histoire de l'Eglise et disséminés dans tous les pays du monde. Une disposition plus logique aurait permis aussi de traiter conjointement des saints ayant vécu dans un même monastère, des saints dont les Actes sont consignés dans les mêmes manuscrits et l'on aurait évité par là d'encombrantes redites. Il est vrai. Mais à l'époque de Bollandus l'ordre du calendrier s'imposait presque. Les recueils da Vies de saints ne connaissaient point d'autre plan. Le travail de recherche des sources était déjà assez laborieux sans le compliquer encore en bouleversant l'ordre dans lequel ces sources se présentaient ordinairement elles-mêmes. Aujourd'hui que le terrain est déblayé, que les travaux d'approche sont exécutés, que les instruments de travail se sont multipliés, on ne se fait plus une idée des difficultés auxquelles se seraient heurtés nos prédécesseurs en suivant une autre voie, qui pour nous serait plus commode. Actuellement la collection est trop avancée pour qu'on puisse songer à modifier son plan.[1] Les anciens Bollandistes ont pourtant senti très tôt les inconvénients de leur système et éprouvé le besoin d'élaborer certaines études d'ensemble sur des sujets donnés. Ces études ils les plaçaient en tête des volumes, en manière de dissertations préliminaires. On a ainsi par exemple les grandes monographies sur les listes épiscopales d'Alexandrie, de Jérusalem, de Milan, de Constantinople, de Tongres, les recherches de Papebroch sur les listes chron-

[1] Pour une justification plus développée, voir Delehaye, *L'oeuvre des Bollandistes*, p. 111–119.

ologiques des Papes, un travail du P. Pien sur les liturgies mozarabes, l'édition du martyróloge d'Usuard par Du Sollier et, plus récemment l'édition critique du Synaxaire de Constantinople.

Aujourd'hui des travaux de ce genre trouveraient plutôt place dans la revue. Depuis 1882 en effet, grâce à l'initiative du P. De Smedt, les Bollandistes publient une revue. Les *Analecta Bollandiana* paraissent quatre fois par an et contiennent des études, signées soit par des Bollandistes, soit par des savants étrangers à la Société, sur des sujets intéressant l'histoire des saints. Là se publient des textes nouvellement découverts concernant les saints déjà traités dans les *Acta;* là ont paru aussi nombre de catalogues de manuscrits hagiographiques. Depuis 1891, la revue renferme un Bulletin des publications hagiographiques, où sont appréciés, à mesure qu'ils paraissent, les ouvrages touchant aux études hagiographiques.

Enfin outre les *Acta Sanctorum* et les *Analecta Bollandiana*, les publications des Bollandistes comportent encore une série de volumes in-8° sous le titre de *Subsidia hagiographica*. Ce sont surtout des catalogues des manuscrits de différentes bibliothèques, la Nationale de Paris, la Vaticane, la bibliothèque Royale de Bruxelles, ou bien des répertoires détaillés des pièces hagiographiques imprimées, la *Bibliotheca hagiographica latina*, la *Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca*, la *Bibliotheca hagiographica orientalis*[2] La série atteint actuellement une vingtaine de volumes. Quelques ouvrages ont paru aussi en dehors de toute série, tels *Les légendes hagiographiques*, *Le culte des martyrs*, du P. Delehaye, etc.

La studieuse corporation était en pleine activité lorsque éclatèrent les événements da 1914. Ce fut un arrêt brusque et prolongé dans la production. Le collège Saint Michel fut occupé par les Allemands et transformé en ambulance. Peu s'en fallut que la bibliothèque des Bollandistes elle-même ne fût réquisitionnée. Mais les autorités supérieures se ravisèrent, jugeant sans doute que c'était assez d'un Louvain. A grand peine les Bollandistes obtinrent de conserver dans leur propre maison un petit coin où se loger à proximité de leur bibliothèque. C'était quelque chose. Mais dans cette installation de fortune quel travail utile pouvait-on fournir? L'occupation ennemie coupait les hagiographes da toute communication avec le reste du monde savant. Un des collègues fut emporté par la mort; un autre, appelé à d'autres fonctions fut détaché de l'oeuvre; enfin le Président lui-même, qui pour être hagiographe n'en était pas moins bon patriote, se vit, le 31 janvier 1918, arrêté par la police allemande et condamné à 10 ans de

[2] Voir le relevé de toutes les publications des Bollandistes, dans Delehaye, *L'oeuvre des Bollandistes*, ch. ix.

travaux forcés qu'on l'envoya purger au bagne de Vilvorde. Cette stagnation de cinq années fut une grave épreuve dont les conséquences pèseront longtemps sur l'avenir. La bourrasque passée, une besogne immense assiège les collaborateurs. Il faut se mettre au courant de tout ce qui a paru dans les pays où un régime d'occupation n'entravait pas toute pensée et tout travail scientifique. Il faut renouer avec les anciens correspondants les relations interrompues. De nouvelles recrues viennent heureusement apporter leur concours aux survivants de groupe. En dépit das difficultés déconcertantes auxquelles se butte quiconque veut imprimer, les *Analecta Bollandiana* ont recommencé à paraître depuis la fin de 1919. Si bien des abonnés, surtout dans les pays de l'Europe centrale, n'ont plus les ressources nécessaires pour nous continuer leur appui, du Nouveau Monde, heureusement, commencent à leur surgir des remplaçants. C'est sur lui que, après Dieu, nous fondons notre espérance. La grande Nation dont les armées ont sauvé la vieille Europe de l'asservissement et dont l'industrieuse activité a contribué à la préserver de la famine, aura à coeur, nous n'en doutons pas, de montrer que les intérêts de la science et de l'érudition ne lui sont pas moins chers.

DOCUMENTS

OUR EARLIEST PRINTED CHURCH HISTORY OF THE UNITED STATES

From time to time the desire has been expressed by those interested in American Church history to see that very rare little volume (12mo., pp. 138), *The Laity's Directory to the Church Service, for the Year of Our Lord MDCCCXXII* (1822), reprinted in facsimile. So far as is known today, there are not many copies of this scarce book in existence, and without it the collection of *Catholic Directories*, which is so highly prized in Catholic libraries, must always be incomplete. The copy in our possession is a gift from the late Cardinal Farley. In a preliminary *Notice* we are told that "*The Laity's Directory* is published *for the first time* in the United States of America. It is intended to accompany the Missal, with a view to facilitate the use of the same." Its contents are as follows: (1) a *Calendar of Saints for the Year* (pp. 1–13); (2) a *New Year's Gift for the Year* 1822—"the production of the late unfortunate Rev. W. B. Kirwan, who, a short time afterwards, abandoned his church, and apostatized from the faith, in the year 1787." The discourse covers pages 21 to 23, and is an excellent example of pulpit oratory. It was originally delivered at the Chapel of the Neapolitan Ambassador, on March 20, 1786. "It is thought that the recollection of this Sermon," writes the editor of the Directory, the Rev. John Power, "was what always kept him in awe after his apostasy, and prevented him imitating those Priests, who, when they abandoned their Church, immediately set about reviling Catholicity in proof of their sincerity." (3) *Practical Instructions for the Sundays, Feasts, and Different Times of the Year* (pp. 34–71). (4) *A Brief Account of the Establishment of Episcopacy in the United States* (pp. 72 to 80). (5) *Present State of Religion in the Respective Diocesses* (pp. 81 to 121). (6) *A Short Account, and Present State of the Society of Jesus in the United States* (pp. 122 to 126). (7) *Obituaries* (Archbishop Carroll, Rev. Francis Nagot, Founder of St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, Archbishop Neale, Father Matignon and others), pp. 127 to 176. (8) *Conclusion: a beautiful Eulogic Apostrophe to the Church, by the justly celebrated Fenelon* (pp. 137–138).

The *Brief Account* and the *Present State of Religion*, the earliest printed historical sketches of the Church in the United States, are reproduced here exactly as they are in the little volume.

I

A Brief Account of the Establishment of Episcopacy in the United States

THE Roman Catholic religion was introduced into this country with the first settlers of Maryland in the reign of Charles I, who granted that province to Lord Baltimore, a catholic nobleman, as a refuge for persons of his religion, from the security of the penal laws, which that unfortunate monarch wanted either the power or the fortitude to restrain. A number of Catholic gentlemen, and others, emigrated from England and Ireland, in the hope of enjoying that repose in the new settlement, which was denied them in their native country. The unrelenting spirit of persecution pursued them over the Atlantic. It deprived them of the just fruits of their labor; it debarred them from every post of trust and profit in the colony which

they had settled; it compelled them to maintain Protestant ministers; and, finally, it enforced against them many of the British penal laws, from the cruelty of which they had fled. B. F. Andrew White, an English Jesuit of eminent piety and zeal, accompanied the first colonists in 1632; and, from that date till the period of the revolution, the American Catholics in Maryland and Virginia, were constantly served by Jesuit missionaries successively sent from England. About the year 1720 the Rev. F. Grayton, and others, introduced Catholicity into Pennsylvania, where in a short time it received a remarkable increase. Since the peace of 1783, and the settlement of the American constitution, penal laws are no longer known, and Catholics enjoy an equal participation of the rights of human nature with their neighbours, of every other religious denomination. The very term of *Toleration* is exploded; because it imports a power in one predominant sect, to indulge that religious liberty to others, which all claim as an inherent right. Catholic clergymen of various orders and nations, have resorted to America; and they everywhere find an ample vineyard to cultivate. In this state of religious freedom, the clergymen judged it expedient to give stability and dignity to the Catholic religion by the establishment of a regular hierarchy; and they therefore petitioned from the Pope, the creation of an Episcopal see, and the appointment of a Diocesan bishop. The Pope, applauding their zeal, graciously admitted their request, and allowed them to elect their first bishop. The Rev. Dr. John Carroll, who had been for some years the superior of the mission, was the object of their choice; and this gentleman was accordingly appointed First Bishop of Baltimore.

The following is an extract from the Bull of Pius VI, constituting the above mentioned see. After the preamble, the Bull thus continues:

> Wherefore it having reached our ears, that in the flourishing commonwealth of the Thirteen American States, many faithful Christians, united in communion with the Chair of Peter, in which the centre of Catholic unity is fixed, and governed in their spiritual concerns by their own priest's having care of souls, earnestly desire, that a bishop may be appointed over them to exercise the functions of Episcopal order, to feed them more largely with the food of salutary doctrine, and to guard more carefully that portion of the Catholic flock; we willingly embrace this opportunity, which the grace of Almighty God has afforded us, to provide those distant regions with the comfort and ministry of a Catholic bishop. And that this might be effected more successfully, and according to the rules of the sacred canons, we commission our venerable brethren, the cardinals of the holy Roman Church, directors of the congregation de propaganda fide, to manage this business with the greatest care, and to make a report to us. It was, therefore, appointed by their decree, approved by us, and published the 12th day of July of the last year, that the priests who lawfully exercise the sacred ministry, and have care of souls, in the United States of America, should be empowered to advise together and to determine, first, in what town the Episcopal see ought to be erected; and next, who of the aforesaid priests appeared the most worthy and proper to be promoted to this important charge, whom we, for this first time only, and by special grace, permitted the said priests to elect and to present to this Apostolical see. In obedience to this decree, the aforesaid priests, exercising the cure of souls in the United States of America, unanimously agreed, that a bishop, with ordinary jurisdiction, ought to be established in the town of Baltimore: because this town, situated in Maryland, which province the greater part of the priests and of the faithful inhabit, appeared the most conveniently placed for inter-

course with the other States, and because from this province, Catholic religion and faith had been propagated into the others. And, at the time appointed for the election, they being assembled together, the sacrifice of Holy Mass being celebrated, and the grace and assistance of the Holy Ghost being implored, the votes of all present were taken, and of twenty-six priests who were assembled, twenty-four gave their votes for our beloved son John Carroll, whom they judged the most proper to support the burden of Episcopacy; and sent an authentic instrument of the whole transaction to the aforesaid congregation of cardinals. Now all things being naturely weighed and considered in this congregation, it was easily agreed, that the interests and increase of the Catholic religion, would be greatly promoted, if an Episcopal see were erected at Baltimore, and the said John Carroll was appointed the bishop of it. We therefore, (to whom this opinion has been reported by our beloved son Cardinal Antonelli, prefect of the said congregation, having nothing more at heart, than to insure success to whatever tends to the propagation of true religion, and the honour and increase of the Catholic Church) by the plenitude of our apostolical power, and by the tenor of these presents, do establish and erect the aforesaid town of Baltimore into an Episcopal see forever, for one bishop to be chosen by us in all future vacancies; and we, therefore, by the apostolical authority aforesaid, do allow, grant and permit, to the bishop of the said city and to his successors in all future times, to exercise Episcopal power and jurisdiction, and to hold and enjoy all and every right and privilege of order and jurisdiction, and of every other Episcopal function, which bishops constituted in other places are empowered to hold and enjoy in their respective churches, cities and diocesses, by right, custom, or other means, by general privileges, graces, indults, and Episcopal dispensations, together with all pre-eminencies, honours, immunities, graces and favours, which other cathedral churches, by right or custom, or in any other sort, have, hold and enjoy. We, moreover, decree and declare the said Episcopal see thus created, to be subject or suffragan to no metropolitan right or jurisdiction, but to be forever subject immediately to us, and to our successors, the Roman Pontiffs, and to this Apostolical see. And till another opportunity shall be presented to us, of establishing other Catholic bishops in the United States of America, and till other dispositions shall be made by this Apostolical see, we declare by our Apostolical authority, all the faithful of it, living in Catholic communion, as well ecclesiastics as seculars, and all the clergy and people dwelling in the aforesaid United States of America, though hitherto they may have been subject to other bishops of other diocesses, to be henceforward subject to the Bishop of Baltimore in all future times; and to this bishop, and to his successors, we impart power to curb and check, without appeal, all persons who may contradict or oppose their orders, to visit personally, or by deputies, all Catholic churches, to remove abuses, to correct the manners of the faithful: and to perform all things which other bishops in their respective diocesses are accustomed to do and perform, saving in all things our own authority, and that of this Apostolical see. And wherever by special grant, and for the time only, we have allowed the priests, exercising the care of souls in the United States of America, to elect a person to be appointed bishop by us, and almost all their votes having been given to our beloved son John Carroll, priest; we being otherwise certified of his faith, prudence, piety and zeal, for as much, or by our mandate, he hath during the late years, directed the spiritual government of souls, do therefore, by the plenitude of our authority, declare, create, appoint

and constitute the said John Carroll, Bishop and Pastor of the said Church of Baltimore, granting to him the faculty of receiving the rite of consecration from any Catholic bishop holding communion with the apostolical see, assisted by two ecclesiastics, vested with some dignity, in case that two bishops cannot be had, first having taken the usual oath, according to the Roman Pontifical.

Upon receipt of this Bull from Rome, Dr. Carroll immediately repaired to England, where his person and merits were already well known, and presented himself for consecration to the Right Rev'd, Dr. Charles Walmesley, Bishop of Rama, senior Vicar Apostolic of the Catholic religion in that kingdom. By the invitation of Thomas Weld, Esq., the consecration of the new bishop was performed during a solemn High Mass, in the elegant Chapel of Lulworth Castle, on Sunday the 15th day of August, 1790, being the feast of the Assumption of the B. V. Mary: and the munificence of that gentleman omitted no circumstance, which could possibly add dignity to so venerable a ceremony. The two prelates were attended by their respective assistant priests and acolytes, according to the rubric of the Roman Pontifical. The richness of their vestments, the music of the choir, the multitude of wax-lights, and the ornaments of the altar concurred to increase the splendor of the solemnity, which made a lasting impression upon every beholder.

Dr. Carroll, after his consecration by Bishop Walmesley, immediately returned to the United States, and entered upon the important duties of his high office. It is unnecessary to state in this brief account, how faithfully, and with how abundant increase to his flock he discharged his pastoral duties. Suffice it to say, that in the short period of twenty years after the establishment of the first Episcopal see of Baltimore, the present venerable Pontiff (Pius VII.) who, in the midst of tribulations most trying to human nature, but equally glorious in his divine master, so worthily fills the Pontifical chair, thought proper to erect Baltimore into a Metropolitan or Archiepiscopal See, and to establish four new suffragan diocesses, namely: Boston, New-York, Philadelphia, and Bardstown in Kentucky. The first pastors appointed for the new sees were: for Boston, the Right Rev'd. John Cheverus; for New-York, the Right Rev'd. Dr. Luke Concannon, who unfortunately died at Naples a short time after his consecration, on the point of embarking for the United States; for Philadelphia, the Right Rev'd. John Egan; for Bardstown, (Kentucky) the Right Rev'd. Benedict Joseph Flaget, characters (Dr. Concannon excepted, who, when appointed, resided at Rome, and had never been in this country) already long known to, and revered by the Catholics of the United States, and whose promotion was considered less as a reward of their Apostolic virtues, than as a common blessing upon the flocks committed to their care.

The consecration of these highly respectable gentlemen took place in Baltimore, the Most Reverend Archbishop Dr. John Carroll being consecrator; Dr. Egan was consecrated at St. Peter's, on Sunday the 28th of October, 1810; Dr. Cheverus, at the same church on All-Saint's Day; and Dr. Flaget, at St. Patrick's, Fell's-Point, on the 4th of November. The ceremony was conducted with great pomp and solemnity, amidst an immense concourse of people of every denomination of Christians.

It will not be improper here to add, that in consequence of the advanced age of the Most Rev'd. Archbishop Carroll previously to the establishment of the above-mentioned bishoprics, the great extent of his diocess (comprising at the time the whole of the United States) and the immense load of duty devolving upon him, the Holy See was pleased to give him a coadjutor. This was the Rev'd. Dr. Leonard Neale, who was chosen to succeed him in the diocess of Baltimore, and consecrated Bishop of Gortyna, on the 7th day of December, 1800.

New-Orleans had already been erected into a bishopric by Pius VI. But on the death of the worthy prelate who governed that diocess, under the Spanish administration, and, on its accession to the United States, the Holy See was pleased to appoint to it an administrator-general. Dr. William Dubourg, a clergyman of distinguished talents and eminent piety, a member of the learned congregation of St. Sulpice, and President of St. Mary's College at Baltimore, was the gentleman named to fill that office. He shortly after repaired to Europe, to make the wants of his extensive mission known, when he was immediately acknowledged titular of the see he administered. He was consecrated on Sunday, September 24th, in the church of St. Louis at Rome, by Cardinal Joseph Doria, sub-dean of the Sacred College, assisted by the Bishop of St. Malo, the French ambassador, and M. Pereira, Bishop of Terracina.

In looking back to the period of the first introduction of Catholicity into this country, under Lord Baltimore in the settlement of Maryland, and contrasting the state of the Church then, with what it now is, the handful of individuals then composing the flock of Jesus Christ, confined to a small province, with the immense numbers now spread over every part of this union, we are at once struck at the astonishing rapidity of the increase; we cannot but see in it the protecting hand of the Almighty, who has been pleased to bless in so extraordinary a manner the labours of his servants; and from the judicious arrangements, combined with other operating causes made by the Holy See for establishing new diocesses in the different states, in proportion to the diffusion of Catholicity among them, we are led to hope for a still more abundant harvest, a still greater increase of faithful: and that *the Lord will continue to add daily to his society such as shall be saved.*

In the year 1820, His present Holiness was pleased again to erect two additional Episcopal Sees, also suffragan to the Archbishopric of Baltimore, viz., the See of Richmond and that of Charleston. The Rev. Dr. Patrick Kelly, formerly professor in the college near Kilkenny (Ireland) was consecrated: For the latter, Dr. John England, late pastor of the Catholic Church in Bandon, near Cork. The consecration of Dr. Kelly took place in Kilkenny, on the 24th August, 1820; that of Dr. England, in Cork, on the 21st day of September, in the same year. Both of these learned and highly respectable gentlemen arrived shortly after, each in his respective diocess, and the most happy results are expected from their zeal, their talents and their piety.

The following is a list of the *Arch-bishops and Bishops* of the United States, since the establishment of Episcopacy in the same:

Archbishops

The Most Rev. Dr. John Carroll,
The Most Rev. Dr. Leonard Neal,
The Most Rev. Dr. Ambrose Marechal. } of Baltimore.

Bishops.

The Rt. Rev. Dr. John Cheverus, of Boston.

The Rt. Rev. Dr. Luke Concannon,
The Rt. Rev. Dr. John Conolly, } of New York.

The Rt. Rev. Dr. John Egan,
The Rt. Rev. Dr. Henry Conwell, } of Philadelphia.

The Rt. Rev. Dr. Benedict Flaget, of Bardstown, Kentucky.

The Rt. Rev. Dr. William Dubourg, of Louisiana.

The Rt. Rev. Dr. Patrick Kelly, of Richmond, Virginia.

The Rt. Rev. Dr. John England of Charleston.

The Rt. Rev. Dr. John David, Bishop *in partibus*, and Coadjutor to the Rt. Rev. Dr. Flaget, Bishop of Kentucky.

II

The Present State of Religion in the Respective Dioceses

ARCHBISHOPRIC OF BALTIMORE

THE Archbishopric of Baltimore comprises the whole state of Maryland, with the District of Columbia. In this See there are two well-organized and respectable Catholic colleges; having each the privilege of Universities: the Jesuit's, at Georgetown, District of Columbia, and the Sulpicean's, at Baltimore. There are besides, two regular and well conducted Theological Seminaries; viz., That at Baltimore, under the direction of the congregation of St. Sulpice, for the instruction of philosophical and theological students; and the one at Washington, District of Columbia, under the direction of the Jesuits. In addition to the philosophical and theological course of this latter institution, children are admitted as day scholars, in adjoining apartments, to be there instructed in the rudiments of the languages, as well as in polite literature, under experienced and capable masters.

Besides the above, there is in this See, at Emittsburg, Maryland, a new and flourishing establishment upon the plan of a college, and affording many advantages, under the direction of the Rev. Messrs. Dubois and Bruté, two gentlemen of talents and learning. Particulars of this institution, as well as of the two above mentioned colleges, will be found in this Directory.

The Noviciate, or school of introduction into *the Society of Jesus*, is for the present established at the White Marsh, Prince George's County, Maryland.

There are two religious female institutions for the education of young ladies: one at George Town, District of Columbia, under the direction of the *Ladies of the Visitation;* the other at Emittsburg, under the direction of the *Daughters of Charity*. Particulars hereafter.

There is besides, near Portobacco (Maryland) a respectable house of female Carmelites. This is the oldest establishment of a religious kind in the United States of America. It was established but a short period after the American revolution. Their number is always complete; a manifest proof of the order and regularity observed, and the happiness enjoyed by these truly respectable ladies, who have voluntarily secluded themselves from society, to enjoy in retirement, that peace which the world cannot give, and which is a foretaste of the happiness of Heaven.

CATHOLIC CHURCHES AND CHARITY SCHOOLS

BALTIMORE is the Archiepiscopal residence. The City contains four neat and handsome churches: The Cathedral, St. Patrick's, St. John's, and St. Mary's.

The Cathedral, or Catholic Metropolitan church, which is by far the largest and handsomest building of the kind in the United States, was consecrated last year, on the Feast of the Ascension. This splendid edifice was designed and commenced by the late Archbishop Carroll, about thirteen or fourteen years ago. The late Mr. Latrobe was the architect. The style is Roman, and the plan represents a Roman cross. Its extreme length (exclusive of the intended portico) is 166 feet, and the breadth across the transepts, is 115 feet. Upon the intersection of the body of the cross and its arms, arises the dome; its external form is octangular, 75 feet in diameter, rising 17 feet 6 inches above the walls. The circular dome rises upon 5 steps, 32 feet 6 inches above the octagan, and 116 above the surface of the ground. On the west end, are two towers; they are intended to contain belfreys, and to be carried 120 feet above the surface of the ground. The altar and tabernacle are of foreign

marble, extremely well executed. On one side of the altar stands the Archiepiscopal throne, and on the other, the pulpit. The organ and choir are in the right arm of the cross; the whole of the interior has the most imposing appearance, and inspires the idea of what the house of God ought to be.

In Washington City there are two spacious and handsome churches: In Georgetown, adjacent, also two neat churches; In the city of Alexandria, one; In Fredericktown, one: In Emittsburg, also one; besides twenty-eight dispersed throughout the country parts; some of which reflect honour on the piety and zeal of the Catholics, by whom they were erected. The number of Catholics in this See is very considerable. They are mostly served by missionaries, whose duties are very arduous, but whose attention and zeal in the discharge of them, are sufficiently manifest in the regularity and piety of those committed to their care.

In Baltimore there are two regularly established charity schools; one attached to the Cathedral; the other to St. Patrick's on Fell's-Point, in which the children are carefully instructed in the various branches of useful knowledge, and at a proper age are apprenticed to such trades as they themselves may incline to, or are supposed to be most advantageous to their future prospects in life. They are generally supported by private donations, and stated collections in the different churches.

In George Town, District of Columbia, there are also two; one attached to Trinity Church, where children of both sexes are educated; the other is exclusively for female orphans, and is under the immediate direction of the Ladies of the Visitation, who piously take upon themselves the care, both of their education and support.

[Then follow descriptions and catalogues of *Georgetown College* (pp. 84–85), *St. Mary's College, Baltimore* (pp. 86–87), *St. Mary's Seminary* (p. 87), *Mount St. Mary's Seminary "near Emmetsburg, Frederick County, State of Maryland"* (pp. 88–92), *"Monastery of the Visitation of St. Mary"* (pp. 93–94), and the *Sisterhood of St. Joseph, "near Emittsburg,"* (pp. 95–101).]

BISHOPRIC OF BOSTON.

Rt. Rev. Dr. Cheverus, *Bishop*

THIS Diocess comprehends all the New-England States, including Maine. The residence of the Bishop is in Boston. This city contains at present two neat churches, viz. the Cathedral of the *Holy Cross*, and St. Augustine's. This latter church has been just erected in South-Boston. The Cathedral was erected nearly twenty years ago, and stands a distinguished monument of the strenuous exertions, the indefatigable zeal, and the fervent piety of the present Bishop and his late ever to be regretted Vicar General, the Rev. Dr. Matignon. Before the arrival of these two worthy gentlemen in the town of Boston, Catholicity was scarcely known there, and still less throughout the New-England States. A few scattered families, made up of all that belonged to their charge; and these were principally of the poorer classes—the prejudices of the people derived from their Puritanic Fathers, were generally strong against them—the spirit which had dictated the most obnoxious laws was yet alive; and every attempt was made, even after the Revolutionary War, by the enemies of the Catholic Church, to keep it so, by misrepresenting her tenets, denouncing her worship as idolatry, and ridiculing her ceremonies. In short, every circumstance seemed to indicate but little prospect of any thing like a permanent and successful ministry. These obstacles, however, did not discourage our truly apostolic missionaries. The Catholic Clergy have no families to support—their wants are few and

easily supplied—their object after their own sanctification is the salvation of their neighbour. They thirst not after the riches of this world; they are only anxious for those of heaven—they are aware upon entering into the vineyard of the Lord, that though *the burden or heat of the day* may be *great*—there is one who will support them under it—and who, in due season, will reward their exertions. It was in this frame of mind that Dr. Matignon, and shortly after Dr. Cheverus repaired to Boston. They entered upon the work marked out to them, not from choice; but because it was marked out to them by the hand of their then Superior, Dr. Carroll, Bishop of Baltimore. They viewed it as the hand of God directing them to what he would have them do. It is unnecessary to state here the opposition and trials they had to encounter from the side of enemies to the true faith, on entering upon the discharge of their duties; nor the hardships, the scantiness of their provision forced them to endure. Suffice it to say, that by their exemplary piety, their care of an unwearied attention upon the poor, the sick and the infirm, the faithful distribution of the word of God thrice on Sundays and holidays, regular catechistical instruction, the clear and masterly exposition of the real doctrines of the Catholic Church, joined to their amiable manners and gentlemanly deportment, they failed not, in a short time, to win the hearts and gain the affections of their dissenting brethren—prejudices soon began to disappear, inquiries after truth to be made, numbers successively to join their little society; and at this present time, the Church of Boston forms a very prominent feature in the Catholic body of the United States. O, truly fortunate revolution in France! every true Catholic in this country may exclaim, which has brought us so many edifying and enlightened instructors! There is no part of the United States, that cannot bear witness to their zeal, and should not be eternally grateful. Where is the youth of a liberal education, sincere piety and correct morals, who has not been formed by some one or more of the clergy of France, emigrants to this country? Where is the College or Catholic establishment that has not been, or is not now under their direction? They have taught our youth, they have instructed and enlightened our people, they have directed thousands in the way to heaven, they have enlarged and extended the kingdom of Jesus Christ on this side of the Atlantic, they have sown and watered a seed, which will hereafter spring up and yield an amazing increase—to say all in one word, by their edifying example, the sweet odour of their piety and unwearied exertions in every section of the Union for these twenty-five years back, they have contributed, principally contributed, to render the church in this country what it now is.

There are in this diocess four other churches, viz: one at Salem, which is finished in a very superior style; one at New-Bedford, and two in the state of Maine, at Damascotti and at Whitefield. In this diocess, as in that of Kentucky, there is a tribe of Indians, professing the Catholic religion, whose orderly conduct and sincere piety astonish, as well as edify all who travel through their settlement.

A religious house, whose rule embraces the education of young ladies, being greatly wanted in Boston, the Bishop has lately made choice of the order of the Ursulines to superintend that department; and accordingly has invited into his diocess several ladies of the above-mentioned order, and established them near his Cathedral. The Convent being yet in its infancy, consists at present only of one Prioress, and six sisters, with two novices. The system of education embraced by these pious ladies, is every way calculated to suit this country. In addition to the useful branches of literature, they instruct those committed to their charge, in every polite accomplishment.

BISHOPRIC OF NEW-YORK.

RT. REV'D DR. JOHN CONNOLLY, *Bishop.*

THE bishopric of New-York, comprehends the whole state of New-York, together with the northern parts of Jersey. The residence of the Bishop is in New-York. This city contains two Catholic Churches, viz: the Cathedral (St. Patrick's) and St. Peters.

The Cathedral is a superb edifice, 120 feet long by 80 feet wide, finished in a superior manner in the inside, and is capable of holding 6000 people. The exterior, as to the ornamental part, is yet unfinished. The style of the building is Gothic; and from its great extent and solidity, must have cost upwards of 90,000 dollars. No church in the United States, (the Cathedral in Baltimore excepted) can compare with it.

St. Peter's, which is the first Catholic Church erected in New-York, is a neat, convenient, and handsome building. It was erected about 20 years ago, at which time the number of Catholics did not exceed three hundred. At present they number upwards of twenty thousand. They are mostly natives of Ireland and France.

There are in this city two extensive Catholic charity schools, conducted upon a judicious plan, and supported by the funds of the state, and partly by moneys raised twice a year by the two congregations. Independently of these two establishments, the Emittsburg sisters of charity have a branch here of their pious institution, exclusively for the benefit of female orphan children, whom they board, clothe and educate. Their house fronts the side of the Cathedral, and is one of the most healthy situations in New-York.

In Albany there is likewise a Catholic church—a neat and compact building. It was erected about 14 years ago, and is attended by a growing congregation. The clergyman officiating in this church, visits occasionally Troy, Lansingbugh, Johnstown and Schenectady.

In Utica, a large and beautiful church has lately been erected and consecrated, which reflects great honour on the Catholics residing there. Their number is not great; neither are they generally wealthy—their zeal however *for the house of God, and the place where his glory dwelleth*, has enabled them to surmount every obstacle to the exercise of their piety. From the multitude flocking annually to this flourishing village no doubt can be entertained but this will shortly become one of the most numerous, and respectable congregations in the diocess.

In Rome, (15 miles distant from Utica,) there is as yet no Catholic church, but a beautiful lot is reserved, by the liberality of Dominick Lynch, Esq. on which one will be erected, as soon as the number of Catholics settling there will render its erection necessary. The situation of this little town is healthy and beautiful.

In Auburn, an agreeable little town, still farther distant in the state there is likewise a Catholic church, recently erected.

In New-Jersey, in the town of Patterson, there is also one, which is regularly attended by a clergyman.

In Carthage, near the Black River, a small and neat church has been lately erected.

The following are the Catholic clergymen officiating in this diocess:

NEW-YORK

Rt. Rev'd. Dr. John Connolly,
Rev. Michael O'Gorman, } *St. Patrick's Cathedral.*

Rev'd. Charles French,
Rev'd. John Power, } *St. Peter's.*

Rev'd. Mr. Bulger, *Patterson.*

Rev'd. Michael Carroll, *Albany and vicinity.*

Rev'd. John Farnan, *Utica and vicinity.*

Rev'd. Patrick Kelly, *Auburn, Rochester, and other districts in the Western parts of this state.*

Rev'd. Philip Larissy *attends regularly at Staten-Island, and different other congregations along the Hudson River.*

BISHOPRIC OF PHILADELPHIA.

RT. REV'D. DR. HENRY CONWELL, *Bishop.*

THE diocess of Philadelphia comprehends the two states of Pennsylvania and Delaware, with the southern part of Jersey. The residence of the Bishop is in Philadelphia. This city contains four Catholic churches, viz: the Cathedral, (St. Mary's,) Holy Trinity, St. Augustine's and St. Joseph's;* all with the exception of the last mentioned, spacious and handsomely finished. Small as is the church of St. Joseph, it was, when built, sufficiently large to contain all the Catholics then residing in Philadelphia. It was erected by the Jesuits many years ago, and is still belonging to that society. The church of St. Augustine is a splendid edifice—it was built by the late Dr. Carr, and is the property of the Augustinian order, of which he was a member. A large and respectable congregation attend it. Holy Trinity church is likewise a very spacious and neat building. The congregation attached to it, consist principally of Germans, who erected it with the view of having the word of God delivered to them in their mother tongue. Since that period, the English language is become predominant, and shortly will be the only one understood.

In this diocess are eleven other churches, some of which are solid and well-constructed buildings, viz: *In Pennsylvania:* the church in Lancaster, attended by the Rev'd. John Holland; that at Conewago, by the Rev'd. Messrs. De Barth, Larhue, Divin, Byrne and Brett; at Reading, Berks county, by the Rev'd. G. Shenfelter; at Carlisle, Cumberland county, by the Rev'd. G. Hogan; at Chambersburgh, Franklin county, by the Rev'd. Mr. Kearns; at Loretto, Cambria county, by the Rev'd. Mr. Galitsin; at Greenburgh, by the Rev'd. Mr. McGirr; at Pittsburgh, by the Rev'd. Mr. McGuire; at Cochinhopen, Montgomery county, by the Rev'd. Paul Kohlman.

In Delaware: The church at Wilmington, St. Patrick's, attended by the Rev. P. Kenny. *In New Jersey:* The church at Trenton, attended by the Rev. Mr. Doyle.

There is likewise a branch of the Emittsburg Sisters of Charity established in the city of Philadelphia, consisting of several pious and well-informed ladies, who superintend the education of orphan children. Too much cannot be said in praise of an institution, so commendable in its object, and so highly deserving of the community at large. Since their establishment in this city, the most happy results have attended their labours, and efforts are making to render their usefulness still more extensive.

There is besides a Charity School connected with St. Joseph's which is conducted upon the usual plan of such establishments.

Catholicity was introduced into Pennsylvania as early as the year 1728, by the Rev. F. Grayton and others; since which time it has gradually extended; and it is pleasing to reflect that at the present day, the professors of it in Philadelphia alone, make up nearly one-fifth of the population of that city. Heaven grant that peace, good-will and harmony, may once more prevail among them; and that the same efforts be used to continue the work of God which were employed in its first establishment.

**St. Joseph's.*—This church has been lately repaired and considerably enlarged. It is now not greatly inferior to any one of the other three—has a beautiful organ with a select choir. The Bishop, for the present, officiates in it.

BISHOPRIC OF BARDSTOWN (KENTUCKY)

RT. REV. DR. BENEDICT FLAGET, *Bishop.*

THE Bishopric of Bardstown is of prodigious extent. It comprehends the whole state of Kentucky; of Tennessee; of Ohio; of Indiana and Illinois, with the Michigan and North West Territories. A few years back all these countries were little better than a wilderness, with scarcely a Catholic to be seen in them. They are now one of the most populous and flourishing portions of Catholic America. The residence of the Bishop is at Bardstown, where a new and elegant Cathedral has been lately erected, which, in point of materials, extent and beauty of design, is inferior to but few in the United States. There are besides this 16 or 18 other churches, large and small, erected at proper distances, to meet the conveniences of the faithful; of which the following are the principal, viz: The church of the Dominicans, at Bornhem; the church of Lexington, those of Louisville and Danville; the church of St. Mary, in a village containing 100 families; also the little church of St. Clare, which assembles 40 families in a congregation of its name; the church of St. Bernard, with a considerable congregation; another not far distant from it, with 30 or 40 families; the church of St. Rumold, with a congregation of 20 families; the Oratory of the Sacred Heart; the church of St. Barbe; that of St. Charles, which has undergone considerable alterations; and the church of St. Anthony. These last-mentioned churches are all of wood, consequently not very durable; but are decent and well kept up.

There are also, in this Diocess, some remnants of Indian tribes professing the Catholic faith; the same having been carried among them by the Jesuits before their suppression. Amongst these children of the forest, who evince a great attachment to this Holy faith, is the tribe surnamed *the Wolf*. They are occasionally attended by one or other of the Missionaries of Kentucky, who instruct and baptise their children, and administer to them the Holy Sacrament of the Altar. As a flourishing Seminary has been lately established at Bardstown exclusively for the education of Catholic clergymen, it is greatly to be hoped that the time is not far distant when the light of the Gospel will be extended far into the wilds of this immense Diocess, inhabited by these unhappy people, and which will also raise up a sufficient body of able and pious ecclesiastics, to supply the wants of the more settled parts. Hitherto, from the great scarcity of labourers, the vineyard of the Lord has been but partially cultivated. There are yet parts of this country, in which many Catholics have settled (chiefly on the borders of the great lakes) who have not yet seen the face of a Catholic clergyman.

The states of Ohio, Indiana, and Illinois, are daily adding more and more to the Church. In each of these several large congregations of Catholics are found. They are chiefly French who extended themselves through parts of this country as early as the seventeenth century. Vincennes, in Indiana, was formerly a station of the Jesuits, whence they made excursions among the savage tribes.

Besides the Seminary at Bardstown, under the immediate direction of Dr. Flagit; the Dominicans have likewise established a college in Kentucky, which is greatly frequented, and promises to be of great benefit to the Diocess. Dr. Wilson is at the present time president of it, a gentleman of known piety and talents.

There is also an academy at Frankford, which is confided to a Catholic Professor, a Mr. O'Hara. It is attended by 172 scholars and has three tutors, besides the principal.

Four religious houses of females of different orders have been established in this growing Catholic country, since the erection of the See at Bardstown, viz: The Daughters of Charity, which is a branch of the Mother House at Emittsburg; *The little con-*

gregation of the Friends of Mary beneath the Cross of Jesus; the order of the Apostolines, lately established at Rome by his Holiness; and the Cloister of Loretto, in the enclosure of which is found the Cottage. All are in flourishing condition, and exhibit in their members striking models of that sincere disinterested piety, which characterizes the true disciples of Jesus.

BISHOPRIC OF LOUISIANA.

RT. REV. DR. WILLIAM DUBOURG, *Bishop.*
Consecrated in Rome, Sept. 24, 1815.

THIS Diocess includes the whole ancient Louisiana, as sold by France to the United States, together with the Floridas. The Episcopal See was erected in 1796, when the country yet belonged to the crown of Spain.

Ancient Louisiana is now divided into the state of that name, whose capital is *New-Orleans;* the state of Missouri, the chief town of which is *St. Louis,* and the territory of Arcansas. The extent of the Diocess has induced the Bishop to divide his residence between New-Orleans and St. Louis, in each of which he has his Episcopal chair. In the probable event of his soon obtaining a coadjutor, the two Prelates would then settle, one in each of these two extremities.

The Clerical Seminary, founded about two years ago, in the state of Missouri, Perry county, in a settlement called *Barrens.* It is held by the priests of the Mission of St. Vincent of Paul, under the superiority of the Rev. Joseph Rosati. The Novitiate of that venerable congregation is at present composed of six or seven members. Several priests of the same holy institute are disseminated in parishes through the Diocess. The Seminary begins to flourish, and promises a succession of well informed and pious Missionaries. Among the priests of the Seminary, one is devoted to the neighbouring missions as far as New Madrid.

St. Louis has a Catholic college under the inspection of the Bishop and several Clergymen, either priests or juniors, the priests are the Rev. M. M. F. Neal, Leo Deys, and A. B. Anduze, who, besides their collegiate duties, perform also the service of the Cathedral, and attend to other parochial functions, both in St. Louis and neighbouring settlements.

The officiating clergymen in this upper part of the Diocess, besides the above named, are the Rev. Henry Pratte, in *St. Genevieve,* a thriving town, sixty miles south of St. Louis; the Rev. P. Desmoulins, *Carkaskaes,* the Rev. N. Olivier, *Prairie* du Rochu; the Rev. N. Savine, *Cahokias;* the Rev. Charles De'Lacroix, *St. Ferdinand;* who also attends the infant missions on the Missouri: The Rev. Joseph Aquaroni, P. of the M. for St. Charles, Dardenni, and *Portage des Scioux.*

There are churches in all the above places, the most remarkable of which are the New Cathedral in St. Louis, a brick building 130 feet long, not yet completely finished, adorned with valuable paintings, organ, and furniture; the brick church now building in St. Ferdinand, on a very handsome plan, and that of St. Genevieve.

The state of Missouri is also blessed with the institution of the Religious Ladies of the *Sacred heart of Jesus,* a precious colony arrived from France in 1818, established in the village of St. Ferdinand, 15 miles north of St. Louis, where they have set up a Novitiate, now composed of five novices and several postulants; a thriving seminary, the resort of the daughters of most of the wealthy inhabitants of this and adjacent States, and a day school for girls of the poorer class.

The state of Louisiana has eighteen ecclesiastical parishes, viz. New Orleans, St. Bernard, St. Charles, St. John the Baptist, St. James, St. Michael, Ascension, Assumption, St. Joseph, St. Gabriel at Iberville, Baton Rouge, Point Coupee, St.

Martin, and St. Mary, (Attacappas), St. Landry, St. Charles Borromeus (Opeloussas) Avoyelles, Natchitoches, to which is to be added Natchez, in the state of Mississippi.

In New-Orleans, there is a convent of Ursuline Nuns, a long standing, wealthy, and most recommendable establishment, consisting of fifteen or sixteen professed nuns and a number of novices and postulants. Their female seminary, which is always full, has, for upwards of sixty years, continued to render to religion in that quarter, the most essential services. They have a public church served by the Rev. first vic. gen. of the Diocess, and a chaplain.

The Cathedral in this populous city, is a large brick pile, adorned with three steeples, and richly furnished; its revenues are considerable, and its situation in the centre of a magnificent square, commanding a full view of the Mississippi, is one of the finest in the world. It is served by the Rev. Father Anthony de Sedella, assisted, by the Rev. Messrs. A. Moni, N. Mariani, and Audr. Ferrari, P. of the M.

There is also, in the vicinity of New-Orleans, a newly established and flourishing college, under the tutorship of the Rev. B. Martial, vic. general Evremt. Harrissart, and N. Bertrand, assisted by young gentlemen attached to the church; and in the city, a numerous Lancastrian School, kept by the Rev. Michael Portier.

The ladies of the Sacred Heart are at this moment forming a second establishment for the education of young ladies, at Opeloussas, upon a liberal foundation, for which that section of country is wholly indebted to the pious munificence of Mrs. Charles Smith, pursuant to the plans of her late venerable husband, the founder and endower of the parish church of St. Charles Borromeus, contigious to the convent.

The Floridas being just ceded to the United States, a priest is to be immediately sent to Mobile, as the precursor of several others shortly expected.

The Arcansas have one. Religion in that quarter has hitherto laboured under difficulties, which it is hoped will gradually be removed.

The number of priests and juniors in holy orders in this Diocess, is at present fifty, and will probably before the expiration of the year, be carried to upwards of sixty.

The mission to the poor Indians along the borders of the Missouri, is now the great object of the bishop's solicitude: He entertains a hope, that under the protection of God, that a large field will soon be opened to the industrious exertions of fervent missionaries. The prayers of the pious are requested for an undertaking at once so arduous and of so vast an importance.

BISHOPRIC OF RICHMOND (VIRGINIA.)

Rt. Rev. Dr. Patrick Kelly, Bishop

THIS Diocess comprehends the whole state of Virginia. The residence of the Bishop is in Norfolk. There is but one Catholic church in this borough. It was built about twelve or fourteen years ago, stands in a healthy situation, and is a tolerably large and compact building.

There are at present six other Catholic churches in the Diocess, viz., one in Portsmouth; one in Richmond; one in Martinsburg; one in Winchester; one in Bath; one in Shepherds Town. These four last mentioned churches, were formerly attended by clergymen residing in Maryland—but in future, they will be served by priests whose residence will probably be in Winchester.

There are no Catholic schools, properly so called, yet established; Though many of the school masters throughout the Diocess are Roman Catholics.

The Apostolical letters dismembering the Diocess of Baltimore, erecting the See of Richmond, comprising the whole state of Virginia, and appointing Dr. Kelly its

first Bishop, bear date the 11th July, 1820. This gentleman received episcopal consecration in the parish chapel of St. Mary, in the city of Kilkenny, and Diocess of Ossory, Ireland, on the 24th of August following, and the feast of St. Bartholomew, at the hands of the most Rev. Dr. Troy, Archbishop of Dublin, assisted by the most Rev. Dr. Murray, Coadjutor of Dublin, and the Rt. Rev. Dr. Marum, Bishop of Ossory. He arrived in Norfolk on the 19th of January, 1821, and the Sunday following published his authority in the usual manner.

BISHOPRIC OF CHARLESTON.

Rt. Rev. Dr. John England, Bishop

THIS Diocess comprehends the three states of North Carolina, South Carolina, and Georgia. The residence of the Bishop is in Charleston. This city contains at present but one Catholic Church; but the foundation of a cathedral is immediately to be laid, which, when completed, will equal in size and beauty almost any in the United States. It is to be erected in a central part of the city, on a beautiful square lot, formerly known by the name of *the Vauxhall Gardens;* which is already purchased for the purpose. The present church, which stands in Hazel street, is a neat building, though much too small for the number of Catholics residing in the city, and the accommodations of those of other denominations who would wish to frequent it.

In North Carolina there is no Catholic church, as yet, but several are also immediately to be erected, for the accommodation of those Catholics who are largely scattered through the state, viz., one at Newbern; one at Wilmington and one at Washington.

In the state of South Carolina, one is likewise to be immediately erected at Columbia. This city is the seat of the legislature, and contains a number of Catholics who are every day increasing. And another in Chester county, where there is a new settlement of individuals professing our religion.

In Georgia there are three Catholic churches, viz., one in Savannah; one at Augusta and one 40 miles from the last mentioned town, at a place called Locust Grove. This last was erected by a colony from Maryland, who have been some time settled in this neighbourhood.

Charleston was erected into a Diocess by his present Holiness, the 12th July 1820, and Dr. John England appointed its first Bishop. He was consecrated on the 21st September, the same year, in the church of St. Finbar, in the city of Cork, (Ireland,) by the Rt. Rev. Dr. Murphy, Bishop of Cork, assisted by the Bishop of Ossory and Dr. Kelly, Bishop of Richmond; the Archbishop of Mitylena and the Bishops of Cloyne and Ross, Ardfert, Aghadoe and of Limerick being present.

There are yet no Catholic schools in any part of this newly created Diocess: but great exertions are making to diffuse a correct knowledge of the principles of the Catholic church throughout the different states, by the establishment of societies, which have for their object the dissemination of books of piety and instruction.

[There follows here the Constitution of the Church in Charleston (pp. 116-120).]

THE FLORIDAS.

THESE two provinces of *East and West Florida*, are by the late treaty with Spain, annexed to the United States. Hitherto they were considered by Ecclesiastical authority, as forming a part of the Bishopric of Louisiana, and of course subject to the Bishop of that diocess, the Rt. Rev'd. Dr. William Dubourg. It is probable however, they will soon form a separate Diocess.

There are two Catholic Churches in the Floridas, viz., one at St. Augustine, and one at Pensacola.—The church at St. Augustine is a superb edifice, 140 feet long, and proportionally wide: it was built by the King of Spain, and is in every point of view a truly majestic and handsome building.

The population of St. Augustine, is about three thousand five hundred, three thousand of whom are Catholics.

The church at Pensacola is a small but substantial building. It is at present under the superintendence of the Rev. Dr. Coleman, the Catholic Clergyman of that Parish. The congregation consists also, of nearly the whole population of the town.

BOOK REVIEWS

Don Juan de Palafox y Mendoza, Obispo de Puebla y Osma, Visitador y Virrey de la Nueva España. Por Genaro Garcia. Mexico: Libreria de Bouret. 1918.

Though Genare Garcia complains that the times—he was writing when the World War was in full swing—were not favorable to the composition of a work demanding tranquility and peace, nevertheless, he has written a work that is equal to his other efforts, if indeed it does not surpass them. It is rather significant, however, that in these days of upheaval and unrest, Garcia should have undertaken to tell us the story of a man whose life was nothing if not disturbed.

In a style pleasing and entertaining, because simple, the author describes the career of a bishop whose life reads like a novel. Born out of wedlock in 1600, Don Juan de Palafox, in order to hide the shame of the mother and to ward off the disgrace of the father, before his birth was destined to be drowned. From this point on the story is truly romantic. Saved by the chance meeting of a miller with the servant who was carrying the innocent babe to the river, Palafox was preserved for an age that needed more men of his character and ability. Afterwards he was sought out and found by his father, sent to school at the latter's expense and thus passed from boyhood to man's estate. At twenty he was overseer of the paternal estates. The father intended Juan for the service of the Church, but such a prospect was anything but bright so far as the young man was concerned. He wished to go to Court and there advance himself. His advent there was an opening to success that must have far exceeded his wildest dreams. Fortune was with him from the beginning; he found favor with Don Gaspar de Guzman, and this meant rapid advancement in the days when Philip IV was ruining the once powerful country of Charles V; days which Garcia has described with masterly strokes that mark the historian and that call forth our unbounded admiration. The young courtier was soon made a Member of the Council of War, Almoner to the Infanta Dona Maria; later fiscal of the Council of the Indies and Minister of the Council of the Indies. Here, indeed, was work enough and responsibility enough for a matured statesman and we cannot help being amazed at the fact that Palafox held some of these onerous offices when he was little more than twenty years

of age. It is natural to think that through such unprecedented success the youthful minister could have persuaded his father to relinquish the idea of an ecclesiastical career. Such, however, was not the case. The urging of Don Pedro Jaime, together with the death of two of his friends and the serious illness of a sister, finally turned Juan's thoughts to religion. He was ordained priest but still continued to remain at Court.

In 1639, he was consecrated Bishop of Puebla. At this time he made a statement that showed the zeal and the disinterestedness that were so characteristic of the bishop throughout his life. When congratulated on the new honor and the opportunity he had to assist his family, he replied, "The episcopacy has no parents but creditors, and these are the poor." At the same time he was made Visitator General and Viceroy of New Spain.

The journey to his diocese partook of the nature of a triumphal arch. For those less well versed in the condition of Mexico at this time the fourth chapter of the biography will be a revelation. Were it not all so novel the long descriptions of the fiestas and magnificent receptions would be very tiresome, but as it is this part reveals in a striking manner how conversant Garcia is with his subject.

In America, the bishop's life was one of incessant activity. As Ordinary of Puebla he gave an example truly apostolic. His work at this period was nothing less than marvelous. He struggled against the native superstition, completed the magnificent Cathedral, restored and reformed religious ceremonies, organized a choir for his church, made regular canonical visitations, sought out and protected the Indians, and in general manifested a zeal and activity that was remarkable for his day. As Archbishop of Mexico he bravely met and conquered an insubordinate clergy. In spite of all this it must be kept in mind that Palafox was at the same time thrust into the political agitation of the time by his duties as Visitator and Viceroy. Only those who are acquainted with Mexican history, have an adequate knowledge of the disturbed condition of affairs at this time.

Nevertheless, Palafox was more than a successful politician. He was a very lovable man, an exemplary prelate and was regarded by many, even in his lifetime, as a saint. The psychological analysis of the hero and the details of the life led by this

remarkable man, as given by the author, have to be read to be appreciated. Palafox died on the first of October, 1659.

Garcia has written a work that will add to his fame. But if he suffers at all, it will be on account of the fact that he has leaned somewhat towards prejudice in many of his statements. His otherwise masterly work is marred by a bitter attack on the Jesuits. The author seems fully convinced that the Society is steeped in iniquity, and he goes out of his way to force this judgment on the reader. Too much time is given to the litigations with the Jesuits. But even that would not be so reprehensible, if he did not place all the blame on them alone, when, as he must have known, there were others involved in the scandalous affairs which he details in these pages. While the historical world will welcome this authoritative life of Palafox, it will grieve that so much ill-feeling is shown in its composition.

The bibliography is complete. It covers over a hundred pages, and it is remarkable that all these books and manuscripts are in the private library of the author. Even were this biography mediocre, and it is far from being that, the bibliography would be sufficient recommendation.

JOACHIM WALSH, O.P.

The Moral Basis of Democracy, by Arthur Twining Hadley, Ph.D., LL.D., President of Yale University, Yale University Press. Pp. 206. Price, $1.75.

This volume contains eighteen addresses delivered by President Hadley since 1910. They were directed on various occasions to students and graduates of Yale University. They do not discuss democracy as a form of political organization. They contain rather a series of appeals to educated young men to develop the high type of personal Christian character upon which the success of democracy is conditioned. The following paragraph is a key to the spirit of the volume. "Our country needs citizens who are straightforward enough to tell the truth to themselves, charitable enough to think no ill of their neighbors, sound of judgment to value men and things for what they really are, strong of principle to sink the ideal of self in the ideal of duty. He that doeth these things shall never be moved."

Perhaps Dr. Hadley's volume is as important in what it signifies as it is in its contents. It shows us an eminent scholar, president of a great university, who undertakes to assert the compelling unity of life, the supremacy of moral ideals in maintaining that unity and the authority of Christian Philosophy as its interpretation and law. The work is a protest by unmistakable inference against the tendency of the larger interests of life to make their own moral codes to suit themselves. False standards of success, the subtleties of selfishness and the wide-spread tendency to evade the discipline of life that results from housing noble ideals in the heart, find unsparing interpretation in the tone that is maintained throughout the volume. There is no trace of academic remoteness in either style or thought. On the contrary the style is so direct, simple and graceful and the spirit is so earnest that the reader is won and held from the moment that he takes the volume in hand. Happy combination of prestige of scholarship, practical insight into the moral problems of daily life and profound reverence for Christian ideals give Dr. Hadley's work enduring value.

The volume contains gentle though searching criticism of social tendencies which interfere with the nobler type of personal life and sets forth a most effective appeal for wholesome living. The moral and spiritual note is not lost at any point. Lessons from the example and teaching of Our Divine Saviour are conveyed with an ease and definiteness that will have peculiar charm for all who read the work with a spiritual mind. The condemnation of selfishness, of indirection in speech and manner and of life devoted to merely personal ends is one of its most practical and helpful features.

The emphasis with which Dr. Hadley insists that democracy is based on self-control and conditioned on the use of freedom under the restraint of the moral law is most welcome during these days of reconstruction of our national life. There is danger that the extent of the confusion of which every one is conscious since the war will mislead us into a too ready belief that we can remedy conditions and master the forces of life by governmental action. We need as perhaps never before to be held sternly to the fundamental truth that democracy is primarily moral and spiritual and in a secondary sense political. Political institutions are

effective through forces that they themselves do not control. Moral and spiritual ideals as set forth in the Christian philosophy of life are essential to the maintenance of our democratic institutions. Dr. Hadley's volume does much to set forth this great truth at a time when renewed understanding of it is imperative.

WILLIAM J. KERBY, PH. D.

The American Army in the European Conflict, translated from the French by the authors, Colonel De Chambrun and Captain De Marenches. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1919.

Although the mass of books and pamphlets treating of the World War and the subsequent efforts at peace and reconstruction is even now grown to unwieldy proportions, we should, nevertheless, as Lord Northcliff very properly says, "welcome all well-informed contributions to its literature." The book of De Chambrun and De Marenches is, no doubt, well-informed on the special phase of the war under treatment, namely, the participation of America in the great struggle. Who the authors are does not appear from the book itself, as it lacks the usual preface or foreword, but we are informed by the publishers that they were attached to General Pershing's staff. Yet they write as Frenchmen, and their judgment therefore appears as doubly valuable, being based upon first-hand information by foreign observers.

The book does full justice to the genius of our Commander-in-Chief and to the impetuous valor and patient endurance of our soldier boys, so often treated with but slight regard by official British reports and unofficial slurs and slanders. The authors always try to be fair in their statements and conclusions. The American soldier had no training for the conflict worth speaking of, save the general training of American manhood in bravery, genial forbearance, and a quick sense of the requirements of the hour; but these qualities, which form the very essence of a true soldier, were quickly developed by actual warfare into an army the like of which the world has never seen. All this is brought out in glowing colors in the work before us. As a matter of course, there is the usual amount of dry statistics on the composition of the armies under General Pershing, and also the summary description of the various American benevolent associations employed

as auxiliaries in the war, as the Red Cross, the Y. M. C. A., Knights of Columbus, and others. The Red Cross and Y. M. C. A. receive a disproportionate treatment as compared with that given to the Knights of Columbus. But this is a matter of minor importance and can be easily rectified in a second edition. On the great question as to America's share in winning the war, the authors have this to say: "The armistice found General Pershing at the head of an army more than 2,000,000 strong. In the course of 1919 this force would have been doubled. Both in France and America every provision was made to attain this result; the powerful mechanism which had been set on foot in view of mobilization was running without a hitch. Transports and reception camps in Europe were kept up to their full capacity. Nothing, not even the German submarine, was now able to seriously impede the regular movement of reenforcements. Undoubtedly the knowledge of this situation had its influence on the enemies' decision to abandon the struggle, so that America would not pursue her efforts to a finish even more disastrous to Germany. The 2,000,000 soldiers already in Europe sufficed to determine the victory. Thanks to American aid, the enemy had been forced, first to stabilize, then to defensive warfare, followed by a more and more precipitate retreat, and, finally, on the 11th of November to a capitulation" (p. 388).

This final judgment of the authors on America's share in winning the war takes no notice of the warlike qualities of our soldiers as one of the chief elements of success. On this matter I will quote the deliberate judgment of a fair-minded Englishman, Sir F. Maurice: "I doubt if, even after the second battle of the Marne, there was a single Allied general who believed that it would be possible for a great American army to force its way triumphantly through the German lines. Many of the American divisions which fought in those last battles which brought us victory went into action with little or no experience of trenches, and with none at all of the hell on earth which constituted a modern battle. The multiplicity of weapons and the complication of tactics which four years of war had produced, and the fact that an entirely new element had entered into war with the development of aircraft, all made the effective handling of troops in battle a far more difficult problem than it had ever been. Neither the American gen-

erals nor the American staffs had had experience in fitting together the numerous parts of the military machine or in handling large bodies of troops. For all these reasons a great attack by American troops against intact German defenses on the most difficult part of the front was a bold experiment. It was one thing to obliterate the St. Mihiel salient in thirty hours, to stop the German rush at the Marne, or even to drive the Germans from the Marne to the Vesle in cooperation with Allied troops. It was quite another matter to fight continuously on a front of some twenty miles for close on fifty days, through line after line of German trenches, in a battle which entailed the employment of nearly three-quarters of a million American troops. It was done because America placed the pick of her splendid manhood in the field, and that manhood went ahead at the job in front of it without counting the cost. *By doing its job it gave us victory in* 1918." (Sir. F. Maurice, *The Last Four Months*, pp. 241–242.)

With these few exceptions we can recommend the book to our readers as one of the permanent contributions to our war library, expressing our hope, at the same time, that the guardians of public opinion will allow no one to impair or belittle the only thing of value which we have gained in the conflict—the imperishable renown our soldier boys won in the battlefields of France.

J. E. ROTHENSTEINER.

A History of the Pacific Northwest, New Edition. By Joseph Schafer, Ph.D. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1918.

Within the limits of a handbook Professor Schafer presents in a vivid and well-balanced narrative the story of the Oregon Country from the earliest European explorations along the North Pacific Coast to the present day. The book, which was first issued in 1905, has been "revised and rewritten" and chapters have been added on the Progress of Agriculture, Industry and Commerce, and Social and Political Change. Since the first edition of his book was brought out the author has had opportunity to make special studies in England, both of governmental and private material, bearing on the diplomatic phases of the Oregon boundary dispute between the United States and Great Britain and the fruit

of these studies has been incorporated in his chapters on the Oregon question.

The Pacific Northwest was brought within the purview of civilization by men who, in the eighteenth century, were still engaged in a search for the passage to India which had baffled explorers since the days of Columbus. Their search discovered, not the hoped-for passage, but one of the richest fur markets of the world. When (1778) Captain Cook's men picked up from the natives of Vancouver's Island skins which yielded a hundredfold and more in the markets of Canton on the other side of the Pacific, they laid the foundations of a vast business which in a half-century covered the Pacific Northwest with trading posts. The conditions of the trade were of the most profitable kind. Certain manufactures of Western Europe or of New England found a ready market among the Indians of the Northwest whose unsophisticated minds permitted them to offer skins worth hundreds of dollars for a chisel or other minor product of civilization. Then the trader, his ship laden with otter and beaver skins, made his way to China, where these were bartered for the teas and silks of the Orient, which in turn were in great demand on both shores of the Atlantic. In the closing years of the eighteenth century many nations took part in the off-shore fur trade of the Northwest, but it lay in the nature of things that the more permanent organization of the business should fall to Great Britain and the United States, whose people could find access to the Oregon Country from the landward side. The year 1805, which witnessed the passage of the Rocky Mountains by Lewis and Clark, saw likewise the establishment of a trading post beyond the Rockies by agents of the Northwest Company of Canada. A little later the Hudson's Bay Company absorbed the Northwest Company and under the benevolent autocracy of Dr. John McLoughlin, "Father of Oregon," dominated the Oregon Country until the great colonizing movement from the States in the 'forties indicated the ultimate displacement of British influence by American in the Columbia basin.

The conflict between fur trader and farmer for possession of the Columbia was a repetition, minus the clash of arms, of the conflict in the eighteenth century between the fur trader and the farmer for possession of the Ohio. In the one case as in the other,

the farmer had the man-power to enforce his claims. The diplomatic argument over the Oregon boundary, revolving about prior rights of discovery and exploration, gave way before the realities of the situation, and in the treaty of 1846 Britain receded from her claim to the north bank of the great river. (It may be of interest to note, in view of more recent executive practice, that President Polk sought the advice and consent of the Senate before signing the Oregon treaty.)

In a footnote at the end of his discussion of the Oregon boundary question the author deals with a matter which has been a subject of controversy among writers on Oregon history for nearly half a century. Alluding to the "voluminous literature" which has grown up about the Whitman-Saved-Oregon story, Dr. Schafer writes: "The present writer, while regarding Whitman as a noble Christian pioneer and missionary, and while anxious to give him credit for every service he performed for Oregon, cannot subscribe to the theory that Whitman saved Oregon, or that he had any substantial influence beyond that of other important missionaries or pioneers upon the course of the history which eventuated in the boundary treaty of 1846."

In dismissing the charge that Catholics were responsible for the Whitman massacre, the author says it sprang "naturally out of the religious rancor of the time." It was kept alive no doubt by religious bitterness, but it sprang from the "disordered mind" of H. H. Spalding. The general Oregon community of that time should not bear the responsibility for a baseless calumny which was invented by an individual whose mentality was unhinged. The author alludes (page 116) to another famous controversy of early Oregon history, but refuses to pass judgment on it. This is the question as to whether the Rocky Mountain Indians who visited St. Louis in 1831 were in search of the White Man's Book of Heaven or of the blackrobes. The inquiring reader will find a diverting account of the matter in Marshall, *Acquisition of Oregon*, Vol. II, ch. I.

When the author in the progress of his story reaches the admission of Oregon as a State in 1859 he dispenses with a chronological development of his theme and in a series of topical essays recounts the growth of the Northwest in later days. He makes clear the dominating importance of transportation in the develop-

ment of a new region and points out that it was not until the completion of the Panama Canal that the Pacific Northwest felt its commercial opportunities to be equal to those of the Atlantic States. In an informative chapter on the Progress of Agriculture, certain unfavorable circumstances are revealed. In the Northwest, as elsewhere in the United States, the passing of the era of free lands and an active speculation in farm lands have promoted the drift of the farm population to the towns. In addition to these factors, the Northwest sees the drift toward town intensified by the application of the capitalistic system of production to wheat farming. "The profits of wheat growing," says the author, "increase with the size of the farms devoted to it, up to a point not easily passed. The result has been the progressive elimination of the small farmer or homesteader, the joining of field to field under the same management, until community life as such has in many places disappeared. In some sections school houses, churches, and other evidences of a former social prosperity are abandoned and decaying in the midst of continuous wheat fields. The owners of the great wheat farms often live in the larger towns, leaving hired men or 'renters' on the farms. These men and their families have no schools, churches, or clubs at convenient distances, and are compelled to pass their days in a dreary round of unrelieved toil."

Two lines of attack on this problem of country life are offered. First, there is developing a spirit of cooperative enterprise in which the village merchants are taking a part. The union school, which is built on a consolidation of a number of poorly equipped district schools, is typical of the new spirit. Then there are proposals to equalize physicians' fees between town and country so as to permit better medical attendance in the rural community. Systems of freight transportation organized by the village and its tributary farms offer valuable opportunities in the way of cooperation. The second line of attack has to do with legal methods of redressing the balance between town and country. The rapid monopolization of farm lands raises a fear in the industrial population of permanent exclusion from the ranks of landowners. Hence, says Dr. Schafer, "it is not strange that remedies should be sought through extreme socialistic measures for land-holding reform like the Single Tax." He does not look for a favorable

reception for the Single Tax until "the landless industrial class shall be distinctly in the majority." As a possible remedy for the present tendency toward land monopoly, however, the author suggests the fixing of a maximum acreage for wheat farm holdings to be enforced through the taxing power and the exercise of the right of eminent domain.

Dr. Schafer undertakes to vindicate the good name of the people of the Northwest from the charge of undue radicalism in politics. Pointing out that the charge rests chiefly on the so-called "Oregon System" of direct legislation, consisting of the Initiative, the Referendum and the Recall, he calls attention to the fact that these devices have been copied largely in other parts of the country and have even invaded the more conservative East. The tendency of Northwesterners to vote independently of party affiliations is noted by the author, who attributes this characteristic to the high intelligence of the electorate. He cites the example of the Republican State of Oregon choosing two Democratic United States Senators in recent years. Without disputing the claim of exceptional intelligence for the electorate, it may be mentioned that a different explanation of this particular event has been suggested to the reviewer, in that one of the Senators in question is a native of Mississippi and the other was a scion of Southern stock. There is a large element in the Oregon electorate of Southern origin which was captured for the Republican party some years ago by the wool-tariff issue, but which is not entirely forgetful of the claims of its Southern blood.

Readers of the History of the Pacific Northwest will find that the author believes it to be the historian's business to interpret as well as to record the human story; and they will be glad to know that in his new position as Secretary of the Wisconsin Historical Society Dr. Schafer will have opportunity to enrich further the literature of Western history.

JOHN P. O'HARA.

The War with Mexico. By Justin H. Smith. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1919. 2 volumes, pp. 572 and 620.

At last, after seventy-two years' delay, we have a history perhaps, with a few reservations, *the* history of our war with Mexico. For the first time the thrilling story of this far-reaching

enterprise is placed before us not based upon legend or partial accounts, but on a solid foundation of documentary evidence, such as we seldom find supporting an historical narrative. By permission of the Presidents of both Republics engaged in the war, every document in their archives was made available for the purpose of the history. In addition to these vast storehouses of information, there were the archives of Paris, London, and Madrid, that furnished, in the reports of their respective ministers, most important and interesting data. Private collections also, as well as the archives and libraries of a number of historical societies, were ransacked for facts and illustrations not otherwise obtainable. More than 100,000 manuscripts, 1,200 books and pamphlets, and 200 periodicals had to be studied and excerpted to furnish the material for the two volumes.

About one-third of the bulk of this work is made up of the notes and references in confirmation and elucidation of the text. A very complete index renders every fact related immediately available to the student.

This vast apparatus of notes and references may seem but an impedimentum, but it really constitutes the impediments of an expedition of discovery and conquest in the realms of historical truth. Innumerable legends concerning the Mexican War had grown up around the main outstanding facts and it became necessary to clear away a mass of rubbish and tangled weeds before this important event of our history stood revealed in its true form and just proportion.

The mass of detail accumulated is so well ordered that it does not distract, but rather draws on the attention of the reader. The author seems to have had Rochefoucauld's diction before his eyes: "To know things perfectly, we should know them in detail." Every item, however, of detail must be substantiated, to satisfy the historical inquirer. Hence the innumerable references to the original documents and contemporaneous literature, making the account of "The War with Mexico" a critical as well as a narrative history. It was certainly a long and laborious task to gather these source-materials and to sift them and digest them and shape them into such readable form: the very success attained, proves it to have been a labor of love.

The descriptions of the various battles and engagements, from Palo Alto to Molino del Rey, are masterpieces of word-painting, vivid, clear and compelling. The difficulties that nature itself offered to our advance through a country of arid deserts, rugged mountains, and narrow defiles are well brought out. The political by-play, also, in the States as well as in Mexico, is deftly woven into the context. Thus the book is fair to both sides in the conflict; in one particular only is there room for criticism. In treating of the genesis of the war, the author takes occasion to refer to the Catholic Church, the state religion of Mexico, in a disparaging manner. Indeed the difference in religion between the neighboring nations may have given rise to some misunderstandings, but not so much on the Catholic, as on the Protestant side. Mexico did not invade the rights of the United States, but the rebellion of the American immigrants in Texas, which was a province of Mexico, was carried on with the connivance of the Government, and with the open sympathy and support of the people, at least of the Southern States. But this is admitted by the author, and does not fall under criticism. The point to which we refer is the attempt to stigmatize almost the entire Catholic clergy and laity of Mexico as lazy, stupid, and immoral in the broadest degree. It is possible, nay probable, that there were cases of moral delinquency among the priests of Mexico, but to extend these charges against all, or almost all. the clergy of high and low degree, is not fair and is not just, Generalizations are always dangerous and when they refer to the moral conditions of an entire people or class they are liable to become slanderous. Every people, every class of people has its lights and shades, and the shadows in their characters, as we think we see them, are often but the obliqueness of our vision and are dispelled at better knowledge and deeper sympathy. "The only Church legally tolerated," says the author, "was that of Rome, and this, as the unchallenged authority in the school and the pulpit, the keeper of confessional secrets and family skeletons, and the sole dispenser of organized charity, long wielded a tremendous power" (Vol. I, p. 60). Whilst the tone of this statement is sufficiently offensive to Catholic ears, the following charge is an insult to every Catholic: "The *ignorance* of *most ecclesi-*

astics and the *immorality* of *nearly all* greatly diminished their moral force. A large number, even among the higher clergy, were unable to read the mass; and the monks, who in the early days of the colony had rendered good service as missionaries, were now recruited—wrote an American minister—from 'the very dregs of the people,' and constituted a public scandal" (Vol. I, p. 7).

A note on page 408 adds: "The lazy, ignorant and stupid monks, whose views do not extend beyond the round of purely animal enjoyments, and include no *esprit de corps* save pecuniary greed, mixed with an idol worship fanaticism." On page 8 we read of the people "confessing to some *fat priest* well qualified to sympathize with every *earthly desire*." On page 14 we are told: "Religion gave no help, and ceremonies of worship benumbed the intellect as much as they fascinated the senses." On page 19 we behold a fat, contented prior riding sleepily . . . through a dozen or two of kneeling aborigines. "Now we come," says the author on page 20, "now we come to the massive crumbling, gloomy church, and wonder where the priest keeps the family which everybody know he has." Again, "magnificent vestments try to hide the vulgar priests" (p. 23). There is a slur on purgatory, a doctrine dear to every Catholic heart: "Why, what a clangor the church-bells are making! To be sure that opens the gate to purgatory for a while and gives the inmates a respite" (p. 25). Finally, the morals of the people are described: "Hardly one of the husbands is loyal to his vows, while the other sex care only to elude numberless watchful eyes, and observe a strict regard for appearances: and in the lower walks a mother will quite readily sell her daughter's good name" (p. 26). Such glittering generalizations are not history, but the small talk of the backstairs and public dance halls, and form real eye-sores in an otherwise most meritorious work. Among the thousands of priests in Mexico, a large number of whom, by the way, were ordained by Bishop Rosati in St. Louis and at the Seminary of St. Mary "Apud Silvam Crematam," there were certainly many that led a truly priestly life, and exercised their ministry with prudent zeal and charity.

It behooves the true historian to disinter the good of even a "lazy monk" or a "stupid priest" whilst he is filling his canvas with the evil that lives on upon the lips of idle gossips. We are,

indeed, sorry to be obliged to say this, yet truth and justice are higher than all other considerations.

The make-up of the two volumes, paper, printing and binding, are excellent, as was to be expected from the firm of Macmillan.

J. E. ROTHENSTEINER.

Our Renaissance: Essays on the Reform and Revival of Classical Studies, by Henry Browne, S. J. London: Longmans, Green Co., 1917. Pp. 281.

Those who will be most interested in reading this collection of essays on the Reform and Revival of Classical Studies might be divided into two classes, viz., those who have received a classical education and who have not yet lost interest in classical literature, and the present teachers of the classics. To the first the book will bring real pleasure for its readable presentation of the meaning and aim of the modern Renaissance, to the second it ought to bring the finest kind of inspiration and help.

The whole field of humanistic interests is traversed in chapters on "The Pursuit of Beauty," "Greece, the Cradle of Democracy," "The Religious Sense," which make up the first part of the work. In the second part the reform is well described and urged in chapters on "The Gospel of Work," "New Wine in Old Bottles," "How to Quicken Appreciation of the Classics." Briefly stated, the reform is one of methods and is directed to the teachers. "I do not mean," the author says, "that we must merely improve our methods in a superficial way, but we must have a fundamental reform in our whole attitude. We must no longer assume that what did very well in our fathers' and grandfathers' time should do very well for us. Even in our own younger days these things were only beginning to be in question, and we went on pretty much in the old groove, with perhaps, a little criticism, which nobody attended to in practice. The question is not whether the methods of the old school, long lessons by heart of grammar, of prosody, or of extracts; the Greek grammar written in the Latin tongue, long compositions and impositions backed up by the ferula and the birch-rod—whether I say, these things produced a result which was good in its way and for its day, but will they do now? Now we have reforms in teaching French and other spoken tongues, in teaching natural science, in teaching geometry, in

teaching modern history. Why are we classicists so slow in admitting that the new science of pedagogy has anything to say to us? But lay this to heart, if we are not mended we shall certainly be ended!"

The author very properly bases his hope for the future of the classics on the efficiency of the instruction. While he has conditions in England and Ireland foremost in mind when treating of the teacher, he has hit off the situation very well also for this country, especially when he deals with the pedagogical equipment of most teachers of the classics. In this country as abroad scientific methods of teaching got their strongest foothold first in the elementary schools through teacher training. They have gradually worked upward into the high school through increased pedagogical requirements in the teachers, and now, since their direction seems upward, there is still hope of their ultimate arrival in college and university. Reading this book with an educational interest alone, one is gratified to find that the principles of method advocated by Father Browne are precisely those which have long been in use in elementary instruction. Their attractive adaptation here to classical instruction is unusually pleasing and forces the conclusion that the future of the classics depends upon faithful adherence to them.

Father Browne enumerates five points on which every division or aspect of modern education is to be tested. We reproduce them for their power of testing classical education, for in this respect they are suggested by the author and serve him to very good purpose in subsequent paragraphs: "Modernized education should show at least, the following five characteristics: 1. The ability to apply to its own processes striking results of modern science. 2. A desire to place itself in harmony with approved ideals of modern pedagogy. 3. A readiness to employ modern educational appliances. 4. A distinct claim to prepare its pupils for taking their place in the modern social organism. 5. A power to commend itself to the mind and instincts of modern democracy."

The final chapters which contain the details of the newer method are admirable not for their content merely but for their tone and moderation. All the methods advocated or recommended are adequately described, as also what is meant by visual and tactile instruction in classical teaching, the use of the picture,

slide, cast models, cooperation with the museums, use of collections, etc. At the same time the difficulties in the way are fully realized and stated and the results of the writer's wide experience placed at the disposal of the teacher. It is to be hoped that this work will find its way into the hands of all our high-school and college teachers of the humanities, for it will awaken in them an interest in method which is the first and necessary step in any forward movement looking to sure and lasting Revival.

PATRICK J. MCCORMICK, PH.D.

Education and Social Movements 1700-1850. By A. E. Dobbs. London: Longmans, Green and Co., 1919. Pp. 257.

The main social movements which affected education in England during the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries, offer the topics treated in this scholarly work. A better idea of the method of treatment might be given were the title inverted and made to read Social Movements and Education, for the social rather than the educational interest predominates. In a broad sense the work is, however, a review of English popular education during the period.

In Part I, devoted to the eighteenth century, the treatment includes the Social Environment on the Eve of the Industrial Revolution, Schools and Literature, and the Era of Revolutions. Part II, covering the first half of the nineteenth century, treats of Elementary Education, the Mechanics Institutes and Higher Education, Libraries and Literature, Education by collision, and the Social Outlook.

As noted above, the social interest dominates throughout, and education is only referred to as it is related to the social institution or movement under study. The educational interest is furthermore of the broadest kind; it includes all those cultural influences which affected, or were affected by, the masses of the people. For this reason the work is of real value as an historical study for either the students of sociology or education. It is very well written and has abundant notes and references.

PATRICK J. MCCORMICK, PH.D.

NOTES AND COMMENT

On July 16, 1920, the Secretary of the Board of Editors had the honor of presenting to the Holy Father, Benedict XV, Who received him in private audience, a handsomely bound set of THE CATHOLIC HISTORICAL REVIEW. His Holiness blessed the REVIEW, its editors, contributors, and subscribers, and expressed His satisfaction at the progress of the work since its inception in 1915.

A complete set of the *Acta Sanctorum* is for sale at the Bollandists, in Brussels. Price: $1,000.

The publications of the Bollandists comprise the following works:

A. The ACTA SANCTORUM of which three editions exist: 1. the original *Antwerp Edition*, composed of fifty volumes, printed at Antwerp, one at Tongerloo (during the French Revolution, 1794), and thirteen volumes, printed at Brussels; 2. the *Venice Edition* commenced in 1734, and stopped (at volume five of September), in 1770; 3. the *Paris Edition*, begun in 1863 by Victor Palmé, in sixty volumes. Neither of the three editions has followed a uniform method. Each month forms a distinct series, which fills sometimes two, three or more volumes. It is necessary, therefore, always to mention the edition in citations from the *Acta*.

B. The ANALECTA BOLLANDIANA, published quarterly, forms an annual volume of 640 pages. It was begun in 1882. With the second volume (1883) a supplement was begun, and with volume x (1891), a *Bulletin des publications hagiographiques*, was started. Volume xxxiii (1914) was interrupted by the war. The volume for 1920 will be the thirty-eighth, and the intermediary volumes will be published as soon as possible.

C. SUBSIDIA HAGIOGRAPHICA, a series of monographs, publications of texts, catalogues, Repertoria, etc., of which the following are examples: *Repertorium hymnologicum, Bibliotheca hagiographica graeca, Bibliotheca hagiographica orientalis.*

The recent publication of Father Delahaye, whose *Legends of the Saints* caused such a stir a decade ago, entitled *L'Oeuvre des Bollandistes* (1615–1915), (Brussels, 1920, pp. 284), contains a complete history of their labors during the past three centuries. As Father Lechat points out in another part of this issue, this volume dedicated to our revered friend, Dr. Jameson, has been translated into English and is now in the printer's hands.

During our visit to the Bollandists in Brussels, we asked one of these world-renowned scholars to make an announcement to our readers. As a result, Father Lechat has given us a description of the work, which will be found elsewhere in this number. As is well known among students of history in the United States, Dr. J. Franklin Jameson, of the Carnegie Institution, Department of Historical Research, made in October last an extended appeal to all interested in historical study to assist the Bollandist Fathers in their project of resuming the *Analecta*

Bollandiana. This letter was sent out to all the Catholic clergy of the United States, by Bishop Shahan, who added:

> This periodical is practically the workshop of the Bollandists. It ought to be in the library of every Catholic house of studies, seminary, or novitiate, and in the library of every student interested in the story of the good men and women who have tried for so many centuries to follow in the footsteps of the Divine Master.

Under date of August 24, 1920, Father Lechat writes us:

> We have at present twenty-two (22) American subscribers to the *Analecta*, of which twelve (12) have come to us since the armistice. Before the war, we had ten (10) subscribers in the United States. You will see that there is, therefore, much progress to make in America in this regard. Rest assured, that we are all heartily grateful to our good friends in America for all they have done to help us keep the *Analecta* alive under the critical times we are now encountering in Belgium.

The subscription price is 20 francs (Belgian) a year. Subscriptions may be sent to the Société des Bollandistes, 22 Boulevard St. Michel, Brussels, Belgium.

An announcement of supreme historical interest is that sent out during the past summer by the University of London, regarding the creation of a School of Historical Research. It is of quite recent years that Englishmen have begun to realize the practical value of higher education and research. The absence of a higher historical school in England was first brought home at the outbreak of the war. This fact is quite frankly stated in the Appeal for Advanced Historical Studies made by a Committee for that purpose:

> One of the main reasons of the disadvantages under which we found ourselves laboring in that time of peril was the fact that we had never taken pains to attract to our island the able young students of each generation, who ultimately do so much to form opinion abroad. . . . A great opportunity is here presented to remedy this state of things, and to provide post-graduate students of all countries, within and without the Empire, with facilities for guided research in our unequalled but too little used National Archives. Hitherto those students have been compelled to go elsewhere than to Great Britain to finish their courses. Before the war they chiefly went to Germany. . . . Meanwhile our marvellous National Archives, the full wealth of which has lately been emphasized by the labours of the Royal Commission on the Public Records, remain only too little studied even by Englishmen.

The University of London now proposes to remedy these defects by the establishment of a center for historical research. Professor Pollard has given a further account of the scheme in a paper, *The Claims of Historical Research in London* (London, Univ. of London Press, 1920, pp. 6). It is logical that such a school be founded in London, and the entire project will be welcomed by foreign post-graduate students. If previous to the war, these students went to Paris to the Ecole Pratique des Hautes Etudes, the Ecole libre des Sciences Politiques, or to the Ecole des Chartes; if before the war, young scholars went to Berlin and other German Universities; if a group of foreign students could always be found the past hundred years at Louvain, the reason is obvious: they

found in these places professors of world-wide reputation, schools that offered them every possible advantage in the line of advanced historical work, and a profound sympathy and encouragement on the part of all they met. The war is over. The armies are gone back to their peaceful avocations. The war has been the cause of much destruction—destruction more savage and total than at any previous time in history. But the war has not destroyed scholarship nor the yearnings of the young generation growing up around us for the same advantages in higher education which so many of us enjoyed before the swift and sudden outbreak of six years ago. To place limits—geographical or otherwise—upon these graduate students is beyond the power of anyone. The University student is not much different from his predecessor in the Middle Ages, when he followed the *man* who attracted him. Today as then he will go where he can obtain the best; and war or no war, if that best is to be found again in German University circles, there will he go again, and there he should, in all logic, be found. If the University of Paris, or the Institut Catholique of Paris, the University of London or the other English universities, or the Catholic University of Louvain, hope to attract the American student, then the courses and the equipment of these intellectual centers must equal or surpass the centers which proved so attractive before the war. London is undoubtedly attractive because of the British Museum and the Public Record office. Nowhere else in the world will the student receive more sincere help and encouragement. But the student must be trained before he enters these great treasure-houses. There should be a school to assist the student in utilizing their advantages. Courses leading to degrees equivalent in value and in honor to American University degrees should be offered. The best professors in the historical sciences should be obtained, and the student should find in all his surroundings that same liberality of thought, devoid of bias, of prejudice, and, the word can be used justifiably, of cramping nationalism, that same historical-mindedness, which he found on the Continent. A School of Historical Research is really needed in London, and it will receive encouragement from every section of the English speaking world. The absence of such a school is a national defect. Professor Pollard states the case very fairly. He recognizes the almost universal custom for graduates of overseas, American, and European universities who aspire to become university teachers to go abroad for wider experience and training in the subjects they hope to teach. He concludes:

> Before the war they went anywhere rather than to British Universities because of the lack of some such provision as that for which this appeal is made; and its absence has cost the Empire not a little in reputation as well as in more material respects. The advancement of knowledge and understanding is the true function of universities; and if British universities are to make their proper contribution to the total sum, they cannot afford to neglect any means of imparting to those students from abroad who are best qualified to appreciate it a knowledge and understanding of the truth that is embedded in the incomparable records of the capital of the British Empire.
>
> London alone can render this service to the Empire and to mankind, to the world of learning and to the science of politics. For London alone possesses the means. Its growth as a center of human activity, embracing nearly

two thousand years of history, has culminated in a preeminence which cannot be disputed. Its records are unrivalled, its opportunity unique, its privilege complete. It is a city set on a hill, and only the light remains for its citizens to kindle.

The eminent Jesuit historian, Rev. Thomas J. Campbell, in a recent number of the REVIEW (Vol. V, pp. 353–376) published a scholarly account of one of America's greatest missionaries, Father Eusebio Kino, S.J. (1644–1671). Father Kino's name has been spelled in a variety of forms, and Father Campbell, who holds to the spelling *Chino*, claims that his family was of Italian origin. Among the discussions aroused by Father Campbell's article, the following letter to the REVIEW, from the Rev. F. J. Holweck, of the St. Louis Catholic Historical Society, has a special value:

One of the interesting questions in the history of a great man is that of his origin; and one of the most fascinating pursuits of the historian is the work of research into the family, the town, the province, and the nation of his hero. The humblest village in a remote region appears to men in a halo of glory if one of its sons has become renowned as a benefactor of men or as a hero. Seven cities of ancient Greece have laid claim to the proud distinction of being the birthplace of Homer. If any one of these could prove its claim, it would now be rejoicing in what would amount to an immortal glory.

Of late the limelight of public attention has been thrown on Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, S.J., the greatest missionary of the Alta Pimería, that is, the Mexican province of Sonora and the southern half of the state of Arizona. Interest in his person has been aroused particularly by the rediscovery of the long-lost manuscript of his *Favores Celestiales*, a complete history of his labors written in a rather pompous style by P. Kino himself, at his little mission of Dolores on San Miguel River. This manuscript was found in the public archives of Mexico City by Dr. Herbert E. Bolton, professor of American History at the University of California, about 1908 and published in 1919, under the title *Kino's Historical Memoir of Primería Alta. A contemporary account of the beginnings of California, Sonora, and Arizona by Father Eusebio Francisco Kino, S.J., Pioneer Missionary, Explorer, Cartographer, and Ranchman*, 1683–1711, 2 vols. Cleveland (Arthur H. Clark Company), 1919.

P. Kino's *Memoir* gives us information of his missionary activity in America, but the data we have regarding his birthplace and his nationality are scanty and uncertain. Three different opinions are brought forward:

1. Some authors claim that he was a German. H. Bancroft calls him Eusebius Kuehn, as his name was doubtless written in his earliest years. Huonder says that Kino is the Spanish or Italian form of Kuehn. Bolton also writes: "Though his name was Italian in form, Kino's birth, education and early associations were altogether German" (p. 29). Shea styles him "the remarkable missionary, Father Eusebius Francis Kuehn, called in Spanish 'Kino.'" (*Hist. of the Cath. Church*, Vol. I, p. 526.) P. Kino calls himself "Germanus" on the map which he drew of the gulf region of California. (*Historical Records and Studies*, Vol. VIII, June, 1915, p. 192.) It bears the inscription: *Tabula Californiae, Anno 1702. Ex autoptica observatione delineata a R. P. Chino e S. J.—Via terrestris in Californiam comperta et*

detecta per R. Patrem Eusebium Franc. Chino e S. J. Germanum. Adnotatis novis missionibus ejusdem Societatis ab anno 1698 ad annum 1702. The historian Volgelsang rather violently defends this theory against Father Campbell. (cf. *Pastoralblatt*, May, 1920.)

2. Another theory claims that he was a Rhaeto-Roman (Ladino). The *Handatlas* of Andrae in the map of the nations of the Austrian Empire indicates that the Val di Non, Kino's home, is inhabited by Rhaeto-Romans, akin to the Romonsch in the Swiss Canton Grisons, the Ladini in three small Tyrolean valleys and the Friulians in the Italian province of Venezia.

3. Father Campbell, S. J., in this REVIEW (Jan. 1920, p. 35, ss), shows that our missionary's name was Chino, not Kuehn, and contends that by nationality he was an Italian.

From the sources accessible in America, it was impossible to decide which opinion was correct. It was even uncertain, in what place of the southern Tyrol Kino was born. Shea claims this honor for the city of Trent, following the *Libro de Profesiones* of the Society of Jesus of the Province of Mexico, which states, that he was a "native of Trent, born Aug. 10, 1644." Huonder in the *Catholic Encyclopedia* says that Kino was born in "Welschtyrol" (Welschtyrol: that part of the Tyrol not inhabited principally by German-speaking people; specifically South Tyrol, inhabited principally by Italians (*Century Dictionary*, IX, 1016). Bolton defines the place of his birth as "the valley of Nonsburg (*sic*) near Trent," *i. e.* the Val di Non, the lower valley of the river Noce, an affluent of the Adige. The Val di Non is called in German "Nonsberg" (not Nonsburg).

To settle these questions, I applied for information to the parish priest of Fondo, a town of the upper Val di Non. This reverend gentleman forwarded my missive to Father Simone Weber, a priest of the city of Trent and editor of a religious periodical. Father Weber answered without delay. He sent me a sketch of his famous countryman, P. Kino, which he had written in 1909. He also added a personal letter which, with part of the sketch, we reproduce in full from the Italian original, because it solves the questions without a shadow of doubt.

> In the history of Christian civilization we, and not the least also among the men of our own land, meet so many noble and generous characters, that I do not know which of them I should place before you as an example, all being so richly deserving of mention.
>
> Among those who consecrated their lives to the service of their fellow-men and left their names engraved upon the rocks of civilization we would mention today P. Eusebio Francesco Chini of Segno, a village belonging to the parish church of Torra in Val di Non.
>
> He was born Aug. 10, 1645 of Francesco Chini and Margherita Luchi. His parents were well-to-do farmers; when they saw that their son manifested a good disposition and an aptitude for learning, they sent him for his first studies to Trent, then to Freiburg in Baden, where we find him in 1664 and 1665 as a student of philosophy. . . .
>
> (From S. Weber's sketch in the *Amico delle Famiglie.*)

The letter of Father Weber reads as follows:

Trent, June 21, 1920.

Rev. Dear Sir:

The pastor of Fondo sent me your letter of May 29, in which you announced the discovery of the *Favores Celestiales* of P. Chini and

asked for information. I am happy to give you certain data by quoting an article written by myself and published in my paper (*Amico delle Famiglie*) at Trent, in the year 1909.

I have in my possession the autograph will of P. Chini, written by him at Ingolstadt, Dec. 10, 1667. The date of his birth I have taken from the parish register of Torra in Val di Non, which is the parish to which Segno, the home of P. Chini, is affiliated. The nationality of P. Chini is Italian, as is and was also that of the Val di Non, which is one of the most beautiful valleys of the Trentino.

The population of Val di Non had the distinction of Roman citizenship, which it enjoyed from olden times through a decree of Claudius dated at Bajae, March 14, 46. The edict is inscribed on a magnificent bronze slab, discovered at Cles and now preserved in the museum at Trent. It is the most important monument of the valley and is known as "tavola Clesiana." It has been described by Mommsen and others.

If P. Chini called himself "German," it was not to indicate his nationality, but solely because the ecclesiastical principality of Trent (founded by a donation made to Bishop Ulric II in the year 1027), was a dependency of the Germano-Roman Empire and the prince-bishop was a vassal of the Emperor.

Moreover, the students of the Trentino who attended the universities of Padua, Bologna and Freiburg, joined the societies formed by Germans because they also, as I have said, belonged to the Empire, and because in these societies they enjoyed certain privileges which were denied to Italians.

Therefore the "Germanus" of P. Chini must not be taken in the sense that he was a Teuton himself, his family, his country, his valley, were and are distinctly Italian.

The surname of his family, after the year 1500 is Chini, and sometimes Chino. At Segno, the home of P. Eusebius, there exist, at the present time many families by the name of Chini. His family was not rich, but well-to-do, and from it sprang many notaries and priests. In 1798 a family "Chini of Segno" received the title of nobility, which is now lost probably through the extinction of the family.

These are the dates which I have been able to gather rather hurriedly. If you desire copies of the birth record or will, you have only to inform me.

I shall be grateful if you favor me with particulars regarding Bolton's discovery.

With sincere regards

Pr. SIMONE WEBER, *Trent.*

From these documents we see:

1. That our hero's name was originally Eusebio Francesco Chino.
2. That he was born August 10, 1645, not 1644, as others state.
3. That the names of his parents were: Francesco Chini and Margherita Luchi.
4. That his native town was Segno in the parish of Torra, Val di Non.
5. That although a subject of the German Empire he was ethically an Italian.

Father Holweck reaches the conclusion that Father Kino's name was never written Kuehn. "He was called," he says, "Chini (pronounced Kini) in his home and in Germany. The *Neuer Weltbott* calls him Chinus. (A copy of this missionary periodical, printed at Augsburg in 1726, I was kindly permitted to consult in the library of the Jesuit Fathers of St. Louis University.) But why did Father Chini change the spelling of his name? He changed it when he came to America, because in Spanish Chino (pronounced *Tshino*) means Chinaman; in America a Chino (*Tshino*) is the bastard of a negro and an Italian woman. To maintain the hard pronunciation of the Italian *Ch*, Chini himself substituted to the *Ch* the German letter *K*. 'Padre Chino,' says Father Campbell, 'would have been a very awkward designation in Mexico.' In Spanish documents his name sometimes is spelled Quino, *qu* being the Spanish designation for the *K* sound."

The honored founder of the Monastery of the Visitation of Georgetown, D. C., was the Most Reverend Leonard Neale, D.D. (1746–1817), the Second Archbishop of Baltimore, and a professed Father of the Society of Jesus, of which four of his brothers were also members. Descended from an old and distinguished family of Maryland, where the penal laws prohibited Catholic worship and Catholic education, he and his brothers were sent abroad to the Jesuit College at St. Omer in Flanders, thence to Bruges, and later to Liége, where he was ordained a priest of the Society of Jesus. On the Suppression of the Society in 1773, Father Neale went to England with the English Jesuits and was engaged in pastoral work for five years, after which he obtained leave to set out for the mission of British Guiana, South America, where he converted and baptized hundreds of the poor natives.

A man of prayer and contemplation, he was often consoled by heavenly favors. Once as he knelt absorbed in God he beheld in vision a long procession of virgins, clad in religious garb and led by one of particular dignity. Near him stood St. Francis de Sales in pontificals, and pointing to them he said: "Thou shalt build a House of this my Order." Then he beheld an Angel who from a fountain poured streams of crystalline pureness, chanting ever and anon, *Pax super Israel!* From that moment Father Neale's heart was inflamed with a desire to fulfil this heavenly prophecy. He had never seen a Visitation nun or even the picture of one, strange to say.

His health having failed, he left Demarara (named by the English, Georgetown) in 1783, for his home in Maryland, where he arrived in late spring after twenty-five years of absence. He joined his brother Jesuits, among them Father John Carroll, afterwards Prefect-Apostolic of the United States, later Bishop, and finally Archbishop of Baltimore. He served as pastor at Port Tobacco, and subsequently went to Philadelphia to replace two priests who had fallen victims to yellow fever. Here he was made Vicar-General by Bishop Carroll; and to him here came the saintly Miss Alice Lalor, a native of Ireland, destined to become the Foundress of the Visitation in America.

Born of pious parents and brought up in heroic practices of virtue in that persecuted land, with several companions she had consecrated her virginity to God. In leaving Ireland in 1794, with her married sister, she bound herself by a promise to Bishop Lonergan to return in two years to help him to found a Religious Community. During the long voyage she formed a friendship with two young widows who, like herself, ardently longed for the cloister.

Father Neale at once discerned the beauty and strength of Miss Lalor's soul and devoted himself to the task of leading her and her two companions to perfection, hoping secretly that the time for the fulfilment of his vision was near. During their conferences he urged upon her the pressing needs of the Catholics in this country—the great field open before her for good, wherein she could reap a hundredfold for eternal life. His arguments and entreaties finally prevailed; the three friends began a Community life of austerity and prayer, teaching little children and visiting the sick and poor.

In 1798, Bishop Carroll recalled Father Neale and appointed him President of Georgetown College, which the zealous prelate had recently founded. The new president at once invited his three penitents to repair to Georgetown and take up their abode with a small number of Poor Clares, who had fled from France, and who now in extreme want kept a little school not far from the college. Miss Lalor and her friends gladly obeyed the summons of their holy director; and a little later Father Neale purchased a house and lot nearby, furnished it modestly with the requisites for a school, and installed them in it on June 24, 1799, a day that he ever regarded as a day of grace and rejoicing, on which the prayers of many years began to put forth the buds of hope. The new school was greeted with enthusiasm by the Catholics, who called the teachers "The Pious Ladies"; the founder, not knowing the rules of the Visitation, to which he was secretly drawn, gave them rules similar to those of the Society of Jesus; and his rules and recommendations were kept with austere exactness.

In 1800, Father Neale was consecrated Bishop of Gortyna and Coadjutor of Bishop Carroll; but retaining his presidency of the college, he continued to reside in Georgetown. The Poor Clares preparing to return to France in 1804, he purchased their possessions; and in their modest library, to his joy and that of all the Sisters, was found the *Book of the Rules, Constitutions and Directory of St. Francis de Sales for the Visitation.* His fervent Daughters now gave themselves to the most careful study and observance of the new prescriptions, while his desire to consolidate them with the Visitation grew in intensity. As the years went by, several Sisters were added to the Community, but their poverty was extreme insomuch that their virtue was often carried to heroism.

Bishop Carroll became Archbishop of Baltimore in 1808, with Suffragan Sees at New York, Philadelphia, Boston and Bardstown. He now urged his Coad-

jutor to merge his Community into the one Mrs. Seton was about to form. Failing in this, His Grace proposed the Ursulines, a rich woman of Baltimore having promised to found and endow a Convent of Ursulines in that city. Still another project to unite his Sisters with the Carmelites was strongly supported. But Bishop Neale, inflexible, turned a deaf ear to all. The fervor of the Sisters, their long-suffering and constancy now induced him to admit them to simple vows, and having given them a retreat of eight days, he professed them on the Feast of St. Francis de Sales, January 29, 1814.

During the following year, Dr. Carroll, the great Archbishop whose lot had been cast in such heroic times, who for thirty years had guided the affairs of the Church, a central and noble figure, now in his eightieth year, yielded at last to the pressure of age and infirmities, and on December 3, 1815, his soul went forth to his eternal reward. Bishop Neale succeeded to his dignities. For six years he had been vainly trying to establish relations with Pope Pius VII, held a prisoner by Napoleon. The world's conqueror had fallen on June 18, 1815, and Pius was again a sovereign on his Papal Throne. The new Prelate, early in 1816, hastened to communicate to His Holiness the formation in his Diocese of a Sisterhood according to the Rules of the Visitation. After narrating the different trials through which they had passed during seventeen years, he solicited from His Holiness the power to receive his fervent Society to solemn vows of religion according to the Institute of St. Francis de Sales. Pius VII, by an Indult dated July 14, 1816, granted his petition in its fullness, conferring upon Archbishop Neale the power to receive the Sisters and extending to them "all the indulgences and privileges enjoyed by the Religious of the Visitation of the Blessed Virgin Mary."

The day of the arrival of the Brief at Georgetown was a day of supreme happiness for the little flock. Preparations for the momentous action in prospect were hastened, and the Feast of the Holy Innocents, 1816, inaugurated a month of holy ceremonial and festivity. On the morning of that day, the birthday of St. Francis de Sales to a heavenly life, Mother Teresa Lalor and the two oldest Sisters were clothed with the white veil of the Order by the saintly Archbishop; and in the afternoon they pronounced their solemn vows and received the black veil and silver cross. On the Epiphany, 1817, the white veil was given to seventeen sisters; and on its octave to the rest of the Community, which now numbered thirty-five—thirty choir Sisters, four Lay-Sisters and one outsister. The Espousals of Our Lady, January 23, brought the happiness of solemn vows to the majority of these souls, so long and severely tried, and the others consummated their consecration to the Divine Spouse on the Feast of St. Francis de Sales, January 29th.

Archbishop Neale, radiant with joy, said: "Now I can sing my *Nunc dimittis* with Holy Simeon, for I am ready to leave this world." An unconscious prophecy, for the angels were already holding out the crown to this venerable servant of God. Not long after, a heavenly warning having been given him, he

began putting all his affairs in order. Among the numerous and important letters he issued was a pressing one to Rev. Joseph Picot de Clorivière, a distinguished French priest who had been engaged for some years in the difficult mission of Charleston, S. C., entreating him to come to Georgetown and take charge of the nuns of the Visitation—his fatherly love watching over their future as over their past. On June 16th, he said his last Mass and gave Holy Communion to the Sisters. Extreme weakness followed, and during the afternoon apoplexy developed. Surrounded by his brethren he received the last Sacraments with holy fervor, and on June 18th, a little after the noon hour, the beloved Archbishop and founder surrendered his soul to God in sentiments of joy and resignation. The funeral ceremonies were conducted at the Church of the Holy Trinity, Georgetown; but the sacred remains of Archbishop Neale were interred in the Convent vault, whence later, after the erection of the Chapel of the Sacred Heart in 1821, they were exhumed and placed in a crypt supported by two pillars just below the Sanctuary, where they are held in benediction by the successive generations of his Visitandine Daughters.

Some months later, Father de Clorivière, having broken the bonds which detained him in his southern mission, came to Georgetown, where he became the spiritual guide, teacher and temporal benefactor of the Community until his death in 1826. He expended his whole fortune in their behalf, building a beautiful Chapel, an academy and a new monastery, as well as a school for the children of the parish. Buried in the Convent crypt, his epitaph styles him with perfect truth, *Fundator Alter* to the Sisters. The pupils grew up in such innocence and piety that the school seemed rather a novitiate with the saintly Archbishop as director and afterwards with Father de Clorivière; seventeen girl postulants had already "gone over" to the Monastery.

Successive Foundations made by the Monastery of the Visitation of Georgetown in various cities of the United States are as follows: Mobile, Ala., 1832; Kaskaskia, Ill. (afterward transferred to St. Louis, Mo.), 1833; Baltimore, Md., 1837; Frederick, Md., 1846; Washington, D. C. 1850; Catonsville, Md., 1852; Parkersburg, W. Va., 1864; Toledo, Ohio, 1915.

The Act of Incorporation of the Visitation Sisters given to us by Bishop Corrigan of Baltimore, is as follows:

TWENTIETH CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES;
AT THE FIRST SESSION,

Begun and held at the City of Washington, on Monday, the third day of December, one thousand eight hundred and twenty-seven.

AN ACT

To incorporate the Sisters of Charity of Saint Joseph, and the Sisters of the Visitation of Georgetown, in the District of Columbia.

BE IT ENACTED by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America, in Congress assembled, THAT, Mary Augustine Decount, Elizabeth Boyle, Jane Smith, Rosetta White, Margaret George,

Bridget Farrell, Frances Jourdan, Ann Gruber, Adele Salva, Sarah Thompson, Margaret Felicita Brady, Scholastica Bearns, Julia Shirk, Louisa Roger, Martha Dadisman, Mary Joseph Rivell, Mary Agnes O'Conner, Mary Clare Shirley, Mary Paul Doglass, Eliza Martina Butcher, Eugina Clarke, Jane Boyle, Rosetta Tyler, Mary Love, Ann Collins, Mary McGinnis, Elizabeth Dellow, Rachel Green, Ann Elizabeth Corby, Mary Maria Sexton, Jane Regina Smith, Helena Elder, Catherine Stigers, Ann Frances Richardson, Ann Magdalene Shirley, Maria Muller, Ann Parsons, Rebecca Gough, Ellen Piggot, Margaret Shannon, Mary Green, Mary Delene, Ellen Timmons, Mary Harding, Mary Ann Fagan, Eliza Susan Knot, Margaret Brady, Mary Frances Boarman, Ann Dorsey, Eliza Magner, Barbara Marlow, Mary Gibson, Lydia Dix, Mary Twyger, Eliza Smith, Bridget Gibson, Ellen Hughes, Ann Wickham, Elizabeth Graver, Mary Councel, and their successors hereafter to become Sisters of Charity of Saint Joseph, according to the rules and regulations that have been, or may hereafter be, established by their association, be, and they are hereby, made, declared and constituted a corporation or body politic, in law and in fact, to have continuance forever, by the name, style and title of the Sisters of Charity of Saint Joseph.

SECTION 2. And be it further enacted, THAT Eliza Matthews, Alice Lalor, Harriet Brent, Mary Neale, Elizabeth Neale, Margaret Marshal, Ann Combs, Louisa Jones, Jane Neale, Ann Wright, Elizabeth Clarke, Louisa Queen, Jane C. Neale, Mary Ann Boarman, Grace Turner, Mary Cummins, Eleanor Miles, Mary Olivia Neale, Ann Diggs, Catherine Corish, Lucretia Ford, Mary Caroline Neale, Mary King, Joanna Barry, Mary E. Neale, Margaret Cooper, Sarah Cooper, Margaret Dent, Elizabeth Wiseman, Jerusha Barber, Elizabeth Lancaster, Matilda Flanagan, Mary Brooks, Margaret King, Rebecca Harrison, Laura Bevans, Williamina Jones, Susan Duke, Catherine Murray, Eleanore Corcoran, Bridget Lynch, Margaret O'Conner, Elizabeth Myers, Catherine Waide, and Ann French, and their successors hereafter to become Sisters of the Visitation, according to the rules and regulations that have been, or may hereafter be established by their Association, be, and they are hereby, made, declared, and constituted a corporation or body politic, in law and in fact, to have continuance forever, by the name, style and title of the Sisters of the Visitation.

SECTION 3. And be it further enacted, THAT all and singular the lands, houses, tenements, rents, legacies, annuities, rights, property, privileges, goods and chattels, heretofore given, granted, devised or bequeathed to either the said Sisters of Charity of Saint Joseph, or Sisters of the Visitation, or to any individual of either, or to any person or persons for the use of either of said societies, or that have been purchased for or on account of the same, be, and they are hereby vested in and confirmed to the said corporations respectively, and that they may severally purchase, take, receive, and apply to the uses of their associations, according to the rules and regulations that they may respectively establish, from time to time, for the management of the concerns of their societies, any lands, tenements, rents, legacies, annuities, rights, property, and privileges, or any goods, chattels or other effects, of what kind or nature soever, which shall or may hereafter be given, granted, sold, bequeathed, or devised unto them respectively, by any person or persons, bodies politic or corporate, capable of making such grant, and that they may respectively dispose of the same: Provided always, that neither of the said

associations shall at any time hold, use, possess, and enjoy within the District of Columbia, either by legal seizure or trust for their uses and benefits respectively, more than two hundred acres of land; nor shall either of said societies hold, in their own right, or by any other person in trust, or for their benefit, an amount of real estate, the annual income of which shall exceed thirty-five hundred dollars.

SECTION 4. And be it further enacted, THAT the said corporations, by the names, styles, and titles aforesaid, be, and shall be hereafter, capable in law and in equity, respectively, to sue and be sued, within the District of Columbia and elsewhere, in as effectual a manner as other persons or corporations can sue or be sued, and that the said corporations, or a majority of them, respectively, shall severally adopt and use a common seal, and the same to use, alter, or change at pleasure. And, from time to time, make such by-laws, not inconsistent with the Constitutions of the United States, or any law of Congress, as either may deem expedient and proper.

SECTION 5. And be it further enacted, THAT if at any time hereafter, any, the persons herein before named, or any of their successors, shall cease to be members of said Sisterhoods, respectively, such person or persons shall thereafter have no control in the proceedings of said corporation, under, and in pursuance of the provisions of this act.

(Signed) Andrew Stevenson, Speaker of the House of Representatives.
" J.———Smith, President of the Senate *protempore*.

Approved: 24 May, 1828.

(Signed) JOHN QUINCY ADAMS.

ALL TO WHOM THESE PRESENTS SHALL COME, Greeting:

I CERTIFY, That that writing on the annexed parchment is a true copy, faithfully compared with the Roll in this office.

. . . . . .

IN TESTIMONY WHEREOF, I Henry Clay—Secretary of State of the United States, have hereunto subscribed my name, and caused the Seal of the Department of State to be affixed.

Done at the City of Washington, this Sixteenth day of August—A. D. 1829—and of the Independence of the United States of America the fifty-third.

(Signed) H. CLAY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ON THE KENSINGTON RUNE STONE[1]

BREDA, Prof. O. J., *An interview giving an account of the discovery of the Rune Stone*, in the *Minneapolis Journal*, Feb. 22, 1899. News report, the first announcement of this discovery published in the Norwegian press, *Skandinaven*, Chicago, Feb. 22, 1899.

AABERG, E. E., *Further account of the discovery written by a local resident acquainted with its details*, in the *Skandinaven*, Chicago, March 1, 1899.

CURME, Prof. G. O., *Interview presenting in a brief paragraph his objection to the use of the decimal system in the inscription*, in the *Skandinaven*, March 1, 1899.

KIRKEBERG, Rev. O. L., *An able translation of the inscription with argument in favor of the genuineness of the stone*, in the *Skandinaven*, March 1, 1899.

CURME, Prof. G. O., *A lengthy interview, favoring the genuineness of the inscription, but objecting to the apparently English word "from,"* in the *Skandinaven*, March 3, 1899.

CONRADI, P. A., *Detailed discussion of the inscription, presenting arguments for and against its genuineness*, in the *Skandinaven*, March 10, 1899. Editorial article in the *Skandinaven*, March 15, 1899, summarizing the objection of Prof. Oluf Rygh as published in *Morganbladet*, Christiania, Norway. These are the supposed English words, "from," "of," "ded," and unusual runic characters.

FLOM, P. L., *Communication showing that "from" was in use in Norway in the middle Ages*, in the *Skandinaven*, March 24, 1899.

BREDA, Prof. O. J., *Interview giving a cablegram from professors of Christiana University, discrediting the inscription chiefly because of its numerous supposed English words*, in the *Minneapolis Tribune*, April 16, 1899. This opinion silenced all who had been interested in the Rune Stone, and we find nothing further printed about it until 1908.

HOLAND, Hjalmar Rued, *First account of the stone in the revival of the discussion, containing a detailed defense of its genuineness and a full translation*, in the *Skandinaven*, Jan. 17, 1908; printed also in several other Scandinavian newspapers.

HOLAND, H. R., The second chapter, pages 8–22, in his *De Norske Settlementers Historie* (Ephraim, Wis., 1908), gives an account of the visits to America by the early Norsemen between the years 1000 and 1362 and concludes with a description of the Kensington Rune Stone. A view of the stone is presented from a photograph, and its inscription is printed in the rune characters, with a manuscript transliteration.

HOLAND, H. R., *Notes of correspondence with Prof. Magnus Olsen and Helge Gjessing, of Christiana University, giving Mr. Gjessing's objections to the inscription and answers to them*, in the *Decorah Posten*, Decorah, Iowa, May 14, 1909.

GJESSING, Helge, *Runestenen fra Kensington*. The full publication of his objections, in *Smyra*, Decorah, Iowa, Vol. 5, No. 3, pp. 113–126, Sept. 1909.

IVERSLIE, P. P., *Kensingtonstenen*. An able support of Mr. Holand's arguments in favor of the stone and in opposition to Mr. Gjessing's conclusions, *Kvartalskrift*, Eau Claire, Wis., July 1909, pp. 13–21. Editorial article in *La Nature*, Paris, France, Aug. 14, 1909, giving the history of the discovery of the stone and discussions of it, and presenting the probability of its genuineness.

[1] Cf. this chronological list with the bibliography in the Minnesota Historical Society *Collections*, Vol. xv, pp. 261ss.

HOLAND, H. R., *An Explorer's Stone Record which antedates Columbus: a Tragic Inscription unearthed in Minnesota, recording the Fate of a Band of Scandinavian Adventurers*, in *Harper's Weekly*, Oct. 9, 1909, p. 15.

FOSSUM, Prof. Andrew, *Hudson Bay Route to Solve Problem*. A defense of the inscription by an able presentation of the feasibility of the explorers' route by the way of Hudson Bay, the Nelson River, Lake Winnipeg and the Red River, in the *Norwegian American*, Northfield, Minn., Oct. 22, 1909. This article was printed also in Norwegian in the *Skandinaven*, Oct. 26.

HOLAND, H. R., *The Skerries Discovered*. An account of the author's discovery of the skerries mentioned in the inscription, in the *Norwegian American*, Nov. 19, 1909. The same account in Norwegian, accompanied by a map of Pelican lake, showing the position of the skerries and probable location of the camp of the explorers, was published in the *Skandinaven*, Nov. 29.

ODLAND, M. W., *The Kensington Rune Stone is Genuine*, in the *Minneapolis Journal*, Nov. 29, 1909.

NORMAN, Rev. O. A., *More about the Rune Stone, . . . by one who was associated in the Discovery of the Skerries*, in the *Ashby* (Minn.) *Post*, Dec. 3, 1909. News report of a meeting of the Minnesota Historical Society, Dec. 13, 1909, giving synopses of addresses by H. R. Holand, Prof. N. H. Winchell, Prof. Andrew Fossum and Dr. Knut Hoegh, all in defense of the genuineness of the inscription, in the *Pioneer Press*, St. Paul, Minn., Dec. 14, 1909. News report, noting resolutions by the Council of the Minnesota Historical Society, requesting the Governor of Minnesota to institute a search in Paris for a supposed rune stone found in the Northwest by Verendrye in his expeditions of 1738–43, related by Peter Kalm in his *Travels into North America* (London edition, 1771, Vol. III, pp. 124–128), in *The Dispatch*, St. Paul, Dec. 14, 1909. News reports, more detailed, of the addresses on Dec. 13, in the meeting of this Historical Society, including nearly all of Professor Winchell's address, in the *Norwegian American*, Dec. 17, 1909.

HOEGH, Dr. Knut. Report by the chairman of a committee appointed by the Norwegian Society of Minneapolis to investigate the discovery of the stone. The report shows that it had lain where it was found since about 1860, at least, and strongly favors the genuineness of the inscription, in *Symra*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 178–189, Dec. 1909.

HOLAND, H. R., A reply in *Symra*, Vol. 5, No. 4, pp. 209–213, to the arguments of Mr. Gjessing in its preceding number as before cited.

UPHAM, Warren, *The Kensington Rune Stone, its Discovery, its inscriptions and Opinions concerning them*, in *Records of the Past*, Washington, D. C., Vol. IX, Part 1, pp. 3–7, Jan.–Feb., 1910; with prints from photographs showing the inscriptions on the face and edge of the stone.

DAAE, Dr. Anders, *Concise summary of the discussion up to date*, concluding that the opponents of the stone have not properly investigated the subject before forming their conclusions, in *Aftenposten*, Christiana, Norway, Jan. 18, 1910. News report of a meeting of the Chicago Historical Society, Feb. 3, 1910, in which an address relating to the probable genuineness of the Rune Stone was delivered by H. R. Holand, followed by arguments of Dr. Chester N. Gould, of Chicago University, and Prof. George T. Flom, of the University of Illinois, against it, in the *Skandinaven, Feb.* 3, 1910.

ANDERSON, Prof. Rasmus B., *Prof. Anderson calls it a Fraud*, a sharp attack on the Rune Stone and Mr. Holand's integrity, in the *Wisconsin State Journal*, Madison, Wis., Feb. 7, 1910.

HOLAND, H. R. Rebuttal of the arguments presented in the preceding article, in the *Wisconsin State Journal*, Feb. 8, 1910.

HOLAND, H. R. An interview entitled, *Wed with Indians*, presenting the probability that the blue-eyed Mandan Indians are the result of intermarriages of the explorers of 1362 with the Indians of that region, *Pioneer Press*, Feb. 15, 1910.

ANDERSON, Prof. R. B. Editorial attacks against the Kensington stone and Mr. Holand, in *Amerika*, Madison, Wis., Feb. 18, 1910. In the next issue of *Amerika*, Feb. 25, are a letter by Warren Upham, Secretary of the Minnesota Historical Society, concerning that society's investigation of the stone and its inscriptions and Professor Anderson's editorial reply.

GATES, Rev. Horatio. A summary of the discovery and discussion with numerous references supporting the genuineness of the inscriptions, in the *Republican Gazette*, Willmar, Minn., March 24, 1910.

HOLAND, H. R., *A Fourteenth-Century Columbus*, noting that a Norse expedition under the command of Paul Knutson sailed from Bergen to Greenland in 1355 and returned in 1364, and that probably they went into Hudson bay and thence advanced inland to the site of the Kensington stone, in *Harper's Weekly*, March 26, 1910.

HAGEN, Prof. O. E., *Ad Utrumque Parati Simus*. An interesting discussion of the credentials of this Rune Stone, with the conclusion that the runes and the language of the inscription will yield "its own vindication or condemnation," in *Amerika*, April 1, 1910.

HUSEBY, Olaf. A defense of the language of the stone, particularly of the word "from," in the *Skandinaven*, April 9, 1910.

HOLAND, H. R., A reply to Professor Flom's objections to the inscription, as presented by him at the meeting, Feb. 3, of the Chicago Historical Society, in the *Skandinaven*, April 21, 1910.

HOLAND, H. R., *The Oldest Native Document in America*, an address delivered before the Minnesota Historical Society as before noted Dec. 13, 1909, giving a narration of the finding of the Rune Stone, with affidavits relating thereto, and a full statement of the arguments, general, runic, and linguistic, on both sides of the controversy, showing the probable reliability of the inscription as a historical record, in *Journal of American History*, Vol. IV, No. 2, pp. 165–184, April 1910.

BREDA, Prof. O. J., *Rundt Kensington-stenen*. A satirical article, noting the improbabilities of an exploration so far inland, and reminding the reader of the adverse opinions uttered by Norse scholars when the stone was found, in *Symra*, Vol. 6, No. 2, pp. 65–80, May, 1910.

DIESERUD, Juul, *Holand og Kensingtonspogen*. Detailed objections against the language of the inscription, in the *Skandinaven*, May 4, and *Amerika*, May 13, 1910.

WINCHELL, Prof. N. H., News report entitled *I believe the stone is genuine*, in the *Norwegian American*, Northfield, Minn., May 13, 1910. This article and others in the St. Paul and Minneapolis newspapers, May 10–12, contain extracts from the Report of the Museum Committee of the Minnesota Historical Society, read by Professor Winchell at the society's monthly meeting, May 9.

HOLAND, H. R., *Kensington-stenen*. Lengthy replies to Mr. Diesérud's objections stated in the foregoing article, in the *Skandinaven*, May 18 and 23, 1910.

ANDERSON, Prof. R. B., *The Kensington Rune Stone once more: Draw your own conclusions.* This article claims that one Andrew Anderson practically admitted to the writer that he and Olof Ohman, the finder of the stone, assisted a former preacher named Fogelblad in forging the inscription, in *Amerika*, May 27, 1910; reprinted also in the *Democrat*, Madison, Wis., of the same date.

WINCHELL, Prof. N. H., *Letters from Rune Suspects.* Letters of Andrew Anderson and Olof Ohman, denying and disproving the preceding accusation, and showing the impossibility of any collusion between them, in the *Norwegian American*, June 10, 1910.

ANDERSON, Prof. R. B., and Prof. N. H. WINCHELL, *Opinions differ on the Rune Stone.* An interview with the former, accusing Rev. Sven Fogelblad of making the inscription, and letters from the latter and from Andrew Anderson, refuting that statement, in the *Minneapolis Journal*, June 10, 1910.

IVERSLIE, P. P., Rebuttal of the arguments against the inscription presented by Mr. Diesérud as before noted, in *Amerika*, June 10, 17, and 24, 1910.

DAAE, Dr. Anders, *Var Normandene i Amerika i 1362?* Review of recent developments in the discussion, including a signed invitation from the professors at Christiana University that the stone be brought there for renewed investigation, in *Aftenposten*, Christiana, Norway, June 12, 1910.

FLOM, Prof. George T., *The Kensington Rune Stone; a modern inscription from Douglas County, Minnesota.* This address, delivered to the Illinois State Historical Society at its Annual Meeting, May 5–6, 1910, is a very elaborate array of arguments, from many points of view, against the genuineness of this rune inscription, with intimation that Mr. Fogelblad may have been its author. *Publications* of the Illinois State Historical Library, No. 15, June, 1910. 43 pages, with a large plate view of the rune stone, showing separately the records on its face and edge, and a plate of the runic alphabets used in the Scanian Law, the Lament of the Virgin, and this Kensington inscription.

SCHAEFER, Rev. Francis J., *The Kensington Rune Stone.* Narration of the discovery, description of the stone, with a plate from photographs and discussion of the inscription, concluding that it probably is genuine, in *Acta et Dicta* (published by the St. Paul Catholic Historical Society), Vol. II, No. 2, pp. 206–210, July, 1910.

HOLAND, H. R., Reply to the article last cited, in the *Skandinaven*, July 29, 1910.

HOLAND, H. R., Report of a thorough investigation of the rumor relating to Sven Fogelblad, entirely exonerating him from complicity in authorship of the inscription, in *Skandinaven*, Aug. 4, and the *Minneapolis Journal*, Aug. 9, 1910; reprinted in the preceding pages 57–60.

IVERSLIE, P. P., *Comments on the Rune Stone*, in support of its genuineness, in the *Norwegian American*, Aug. 12, 1910.

GREVSTAD, N. A., Editorial review of Professor Flom's address, before noted, the reviewer's conclusion being that the arguments in favor of the stone are stronger than its opponents admit, in the *Skandinaven*, Sept. 5, 1910.

HOLAND, H. R., *Mere om Kensington Stenen.* Statement of the geological features of the stone, and notes of the opinions of experts concerning the antiquity of the inscription, in the *Skandinaven*, Sept. 17, 1910.

PETTERSON, A. E., An interesting summary of Icelandic traditions of late voyages to Vinland, supporting the genuineness of the stone, in the *Skandinaven*, Sept. 24, 1910.

HOLAND, H. R., *Are there English Words on the Kensington Rune Stone?* An investigation of the supposed English words (the most common objection) showing them to be of ancient Norse usage, exhibiting philological features impossible for a forger. *Records of the Past*, Vol. IX, Part V, pp. 240–245, Sept.-Oct. 1910.

HOLAND, H. R., *The Kensington Rune Stone*, in the *Wisconsin Magazine of History*, Vol. III, (1919) No. 2, pp. 153–183. Presents the latest phases of the discussion concerning the Rune Stone.

HOLAND, H. R., *Further Discoveries concerning the Kensington Rune Stone, ibid.*, Vol. III (1919), No. 3, pp. 332–338.

REV. FRANCIS J. SCHAEFER, D.D.
St. Paul, Minn.

SISTERS OF NOTRE DAME
331 E. Rich Street
COLUMBUS, OHIO

BOOKS RECEIVED

(*Mention here does not preclude extended notices in later issues of the* REVIEW.)

Almanach Catholique Français pour 1920. Preface by Msgr. A. Baudrillart. Paris: Bloud and Gay, 1920. Pp. 448+xxxii.

The American Year Book. A Record of Events and Progress, 1919. Edited by Francis G. Wickware, B.A., B.Sc. New York: D. Appleton and Co., 1920. Pp. 873.

AYUSAWA, IWAO FREDERICK, Ph.D. *International Labor Legislation* in *Studies in History, Economics and Public Law,* Volume xci, No. 2. New York: Columbia University Press, 1920. Pp. 258.

BAILEY, SMALLWOOD REVELEY. *Biology for High Schools.* New York: Allyn and Bacon, 1920. Pp. 550+40.

BITTREMIEUX, J. *Lessius et le Droit de Guerre.* Brussels: Librairie Albert Dewit. Pp. 168.

BROWN, EVERETT SOMERVILLE. *Constitutional History of the Louisiana Purchase.* University of California Publications in History, Volume x. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1920. Pp. 248.

BUSHNELL, DAVID I., Jr. *Native Cemeteries and Forms of Burial East of the Mississippi.* Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1920. Pp. 160.

GILLESPIE, JAMES E., Ph.D. *The Influence in Oversea Expansion in England to* 1700 in *Studies in History, Economics and Public Law,* Volume xci, No. 1. New York: Longmans, Green and Co., 1920. Pp. 367.

HASKINS, CHARLES HOMER, and LORD, ROBERT HOWARD. *Some Problems of the Peace Conference.* Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1920. Pp. 307.

HILL, OWEN A., S.J., Ph.D. *Ethics, General and Special.* New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920. Pp. 414.

Historical Records and Studies. U. S. Catholic Historical Society. Thomas F. Meehan, Stephen Farrelly and Rev. Joseph Delany, D.D., Editing Committee. Volume xiv. May, 1920. New York. Pp. 213.

JULIEN, MSGR. E. L. *Vers la Victoire, Discours,* 1914–1919. Paris: Pierre Tequi, 1920. Pp. 392.

JULY, GABRIEL. *En Marge des Combats.* Notre Dame de Lourdes et la Grande Guerre. With preface by Msgr. Ch. Lagier. Paris: Pierre Tequi, 1920. Pp. 226.

KLEIN, PHILIP, D.D. *Prison Methods in New York State.* In *Studies in History, Economics and Public Law.* Edited by the Faculty of Political Sciences of Columbia University, Volume xc, No. 1. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1920. Pp. 420.

LEJOIE, LOUIS. *Transfigurée par l'Eucharistie et par la lutte.* Paris: Pierre Tequi, 1920. Pp. 110.

MILLOT, REV. J. *Retraite de Première Communion Solennelle.* Paris: Pierre Tequi, 1920. Pp. 310.

MORGAN, WILLIAM THOMAS, A.M., Ph.D. *English Political Parties and Leaders in the Reign of Queen Anne,* 1702–1710. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1920. Pp. 427.

POTTER, MOTHER MAYR. *The Brides of Christ.* Chicago: Matre and Company, 1920. Pp. 109.

Proceedings of the American Antiquarian Society at the Semi-Annual Meeting held in Boston, April, 1919. Part I, Volume 29. Published by the Society, Worcester, Mass., 1920. Pp. 180.

Religious Bodies, 1916. In Bulletin 142. Bureau of the Census, Department of Commerce. Washington, D. C.: Government Printing Office, 1920. Pp. 192.

ROBERTS, R. A. *Helpers for Students of History*. The Reports of the Historical MSS. Commission. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1920. Pp. 91.

ROUAULT, ABBE F. *Admirable Histoire de Joseph*. Paris: Pierre Tequi, 1919. Pp. 138.

ROUPAIN, REV. E., S.J. *Carnet de Jeanne D'Arc*, 1412–1431. Paris: Pierre Tequi, 1920. Pp. 156.

SCOTT, JAMES BROWN. *James Madison's Notes of Debates in the Federal Convention of* 1787. New York: 1918. Pp. 149.

St. Benedict's Calendar, Volume xvii, No. 1. St. Benedict's Church, Atchison, Kans., 1920. Pp. 72.

STECK, FRANCIS BORGIA, O.F.M. *Franciscans and the Protestant Revolution in England*. Teutopolis, 1920. Pp. 344.

TISSIER, MSGR. J. *Le Bon Esprit au Collège*. Paris: Pierre Tequi, 1920. Pp. 279.

——— ———. *Nos Tributs de Gloire. Retrait donnée à Lourdes*. Paris: Pierre Tequi, 1920. Pp. 298.

UPHAM, WARREN. *Minnesota Geographic Names, their Origin and Historic significance*, in *Collections* of Minnesota Historical Society, Volume xvii. St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society, 1920. Pp. 735.

VAN DER HEYDEN, REV. JOSEPH. *Life and Letters of Father Brabant, a Flemish Missionary Hero*. Louvain, 1920. Pp. 250.

VESTAL, S. C. *The Maintenance of Peace*. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1920. Pp. 284.

WATKINS, OSCAR D., M.A. *A History of Penance*. Volumes i and ii. New York: Longmans, Green and Company, 1920. Pp. 775.

WELD, WILLIAM ERNEST, Ph.D. *India's Demand for Transportation*. In *Studies in History, Economics and Public Law*. Volume xc, No. 2. New York: Columbia University Press, 1920. Pp. 127.